

COMPLIMENTARY COPY

Philosophical
Traditions
Today

M. IOVCHUK

Philosophical Traditions Today



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian

М. Т. НОВЧУК
ФИЛОСОФСКИЕ ТРАДИЦИИ И
СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ

На азербайджанском языке

First printing 1973

© Translation into English from revised Russian edition,
Progress Publishers 1973

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

Author's Foreword to the English Edition	7
<i>Introduction</i>	9
 <i>Chapter I. LENINISM AND MAN'S PHILOSOPHICAL HERITAGE</i>	 20
1. Lenin's Development of the Marxist Principles of Research into the History of Philosophy	20
2. Lenin's Struggle to Champion Man's Philosophical Heritage and Its Finest Traditions	33
3 The Fundamental Difference Between the Marxist-Leninist View on Man's Philosophical Heritage and Modern Bourgeois Concepts of the History of Philosophy	47
 <i>Chapter II. MARXIST PHILOSOPHY IN THE 19TH CENTURY. ITS TRADITIONS</i>	 56
1. Dialectical Materialism of Marx and Engels and the Philosophical Traditions Preceding It	56
2 The History of Marxist Philosophy in the Distorting Mirror of Bourgeois and Revisionist Marxology	67
3. Historical Path of the Philosophy of Marx and Engels and Its Traditions (on the Genesis, Subject-Matter and Structure of Marxist Philosophy)	87
4. The Problem of Man in Marx's Philosophy	102
5. Division into Periods and the Objective Laws of the History of Marxist Philosophy, the Continuity of Its Traditions .	111
6. Traditions of Marx and Engels Carried Forward by Nineteenth-Century Marxist Philosophers (Plekhanov, Paul Lafargue, Franz Mehring and others)	122

III	LENINIST STAGE IN THE HISTORY OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY. ITS TRADITIONS AND PROBLEMS IN THE 20TH CENTURY . . .	135
	The Leninist Stage in the Development of Marxism . . .	136
2	Characteristic Features of the Leninist Stage in the History of Marxist Philosophy. Lenin's Contribution to Dialectical and Historical Materialism	153
Chapter IV	PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS IN THE HIS- TORY OF SOVIET SCIENCE	179
1	Attitudes adopted to Various Philosophical Traditions After the October Revolution	179
2	Marxist-Leninist Defence of the Finest Philosophical Tradi- tions Their Study and Development by Soviet Philosophers . .	191
3	Historical Landmarks and Distinctive Features of the Devel- opment of Leninist Traditions in Soviet Philosophical Science .	197
Chapter V	LENINIST PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVE- MENT AND THE CURRENT IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE	209
1	The Dissemination and Development of Marxist-Leninist Ideas Outside the Soviet Union Since 1917	209
2	Certain Aspects of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy in Other Countries at the Present Stage of Development (the 1960s) . .	222
3	Leninist Traditions in Research into the Philosophical Heri- tage of the Past and in the Criticism of Modern Bourgeois Philosophy	245
4	The Significance of Leninist Philosophical Traditions for the International Communist Movement Today	259
Chapter VI	ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY OF MARXIST- LENINIST PHILOSOPHY TOPICAL IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESENT-DAY IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE	268
1	The History of Marxism-Leninism and Its Philosophy—Con- troversial Terrain in the Present Ideological Struggle	268
2	Achievements, Problems and Future Prospects of Research into the History of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy	280
Conclusion	294

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

This book is a translation of the Russian edition of *Leninism, Philosophical Traditions and the Present* written for the centenary of Lenin's birth and put out by Mysl Publishers, in Moscow, in 1970.

The book was published over two years ago and I should like to point out in the foreword of this edition for foreign readers that the course of ideological and political events and of theoretical development during the intervening period has borne out the fundamental propositions and forecasts put forward by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (1969), especially those contained in its document On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, in the documents issued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in connection with that occasion, and in Comrade Brezhnev's report "Lenin's Cause Lives On and Triumphs".

The historic 24th Congress of the CPSU has enriched the treasure-house of Marxist-Leninist theory, including philosophical theory, with new conclusions and propositions which continue and develop Lenin's immortal ideas. Since it is hardly possible to discuss here these fresh contributions to Marxist theory, the reader is referred to the documents of the 24th CPSU Congress and materials of the conference devoted to the 24th CPSU Congress and the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, held at the end of September, 1971, in Moscow. The latter are available in Russian and German and English.

The documents and materials of the 24th Congress of the CPSU corroborate once again the historic significance and enduring relevance of Lenin's doctrine, making it quite clear that theoretical study is an important part of Communists' internationalist duty.

"Criticism of the bourgeois and revisionist attacks on our theory and practice," Comrade Brezhnev told the 24th Party Congress, "becomes much more convincing when it is founded on active and creative development of the social sciences, of Marxist-Leninist theory."* Soviet and other Marxist philosophers have this in mind as they turn to philosophical traditions in order to work out and provide solutions for the urgent and vital problems of this day and age.

M. Iovchuk

* 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 124.

INTRODUCTION

The present era is a time of momentous change for mankind. It is an era of social revolution and phenomenal progress in science and technology, of fierce class and ideological battles.

At the core of the ideological struggle and intellectual progress there lie philosophical issues, primarily the problems of man's attitude to the world, including the "spiritual world", which men create and hand down from one generation to another. Scientific answers to these, as well as other current social and theoretical problems, are provided today by Marxism-Leninism.

In 1970 the world communist movement, the Soviet people, and progressive men and women everywhere, celebrated the centenary of Lenin's birth, focussing attention on the study and continuation of the great traditions, in particular philosophical traditions which developed from Lenin's ideas.

Another landmark in the history of Marxist thought was the 50th anniversary of the publication of Lenin's "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", justly considered to be his philosophical testament, which fell in March, 1972.

In this concise article Lenin brilliantly charted the progress of scientific materialist views for many years to come, pointing out the necessity of close links between Marxist philosophy and natural science, of combatting religion and every form of religious ideology, developing Marxist doctrine, and absorbing the best materialist, dialectical and atheistic traditions of philosophical thought.

A thorough and creative approach to man's philosophical heritage is an immutable tradition of Marxism-Leninism.

In tackling topical aspects of social or scientific progress or of theory, Marxist-Leninist writers invariably refer to man's spiritual heritage. In the best works and progressive traditions of philosophy, social thought and culture, the working class and other progressive forces of contemporary society find an invaluable foundation for development of the socialist thought of today.

A philosophical tradition implies a more or less stable relationship of philosophical ideas, categories and modes of thought, which emerge in the process of philosophical cognition of nature, ideas and society. Its character and trend depend on how much this stable relationship of philosophical knowledge is in line with the requirements of a subsequent period. A philosophical tradition is not immutable, not fixed once and for all. Hegel wrote that one should not regard tradition as a housekeeper bound to preserve the property committed to her charge. Any philosophical tradition—especially if it is progressive—may be enriched and acquire a new ring in the context of a new historical epoch. But it may also happen that a philosophical tradition, in rejecting the main trend of another tradition essentially at odds with the new age and its scientific and philosophical knowledge, recoils from it and begins to develop into its opposite. So in the Soviet Union after the 1917 October Revolution, scientists and intellectuals in general, most of whom had come to share the ideology of the proletariat, the leading revolutionary class of the new epoch, renounced the philosophical tradition prevailing before October 1917, embodied in religious, theosophic, mystic and other idealist doctrines.

Lenin and his supporters always attached much importance to the evaluation of various philosophical doctrines and concepts from the standpoint of the fundamental interests and outlook of the revolutionary proletariat. Each current of contemporary philosophical thought expressing the views of certain social classes and groups adopts its own particular approach to philosophical traditions. Ideas on this point vary considerably. On the one hand, certain representatives of the bourgeois idealist trend, "philosophy of science", flaunt the triumphs of modern science and

scorn philosophical traditions, describing the history of philosophy as a "fruitless battle of conflicting ideas". On the other hand, so-called revolutionists preach a nihilistic attitude towards man's cultural heritage, rejecting the progressive and humanist traditions of national and world philosophy, declaring them alien to the spirit of this revolutionary epoch. Conservative idealist views on philosophical tradition, such as the notion that, in point of fact, nothing new emerges in philosophy, apart from certain modifications of allegedly perennial and imperishable philosophical ideas, are still widely held.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy treats the problem of philosophical tradition in its various aspects, the historico-theoretical aspect being of particular significance to Marxism. The Marxist-Leninist angle on the relation between philosophy past and present was clearly defined by Lenin, who wrote that modern scientific philosophy, founded by Marx, was the result, the sum, the conclusion drawn from the history of cognition of the world, that it had furnished answers to questions already raised by the foremost minds of mankind, being the direct and immediate continuation of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy.*

Next, there is a logical-epistemological aspect of the problem of philosophical tradition which also comes to the fore in the new epoch. The technological revolution, the rapid all-round progress of scientific knowledge, the enormous increase in information, all require a further elaboration of the logic of scientific thought. This presupposes thorough knowledge of the treasures of mankind's philosophical heritage, of its logical-conceptual apparatus. The study of the long history of philosophy and its instructive lessons make it possible to single out from the enormous wealth of philosophical ideas and concepts all that which has stood the test of time and distinguish among the host of concepts and ideas the searching quests for precious truth. This study also enables us to uncover the epistemological roots of many errors and misconceptions and so put contemporary philosophers on their guard against them.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 23.

In the present age, the peoples' sense of national identity has grown enormously, especially in countries that have recently gained their independence and shaken off social and colonial oppression. The path of these countries' social and cultural development is now being mapped out with due consideration for national history and peculiarities. Hence the importance of a correct appreciation of the degree to which national culture has influenced philosophical traditions.

Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought denounces the reactionary conceptions of Eurocentrism and Asiacentrism which isolate the development of culture and philosophical doctrines in East and West, contrasting them to each other. Marxist historians of philosophy prove that while social and academic conditions were not equally favourable to the advance of philosophical thought everywhere, diverse philosophical doctrines (both materialist and idealist) which have played a conspicuous part in the intellectual life of nations, and contributed to the treasure-house of philosophical knowledge, nevertheless emerged and developed in many countries, both in East and West.

Marxist-Leninist philosophers investigate in particular the intrinsic continuity existing between the evolution of philosophical doctrines—Hegel defined a philosophical doctrine as an "epoch fixed in thought", the intellectual quintessence of an epoch—and the social movements that summon forth intellectual activity from the midst of stagnation, reaction and obscurantism. When considering philosophical traditions, Marxist historians of philosophy trace their connection with the contemporary struggle of ideas, with the ideological struggle between different classes, thereby elucidating the ideological aspect of the history of philosophy, of the development of philosophical traditions.

Thus, Marxist-Leninist philosophy investigates the historico-theoretical, logical-epistemological, national-cultural, ideological and other aspects of the development of tradition in the historical process of solving philosophical problems in accordance with the requirements of social life and science.

As early as the end of the nineteenth century, Lenin defined the principles of the Marxist dialectical approach to man's heritage of philosophical thought and, indeed, social

thought in general, showing that Marxists do not merely accept this heritage but study it in order to supply the answers to fresh problems from the social standpoint of the new class, the revolutionary proletariat.* At the same time, they do not judge philosophical and social doctrines of the past by the contributions historical personalities did not make in respect of modern requirements, but by the new contributions they did make as compared with their predecessors.** These fundamental principles of the Marxist attitude to traditions of social thought, including philosophy, retain their methodological significance in the present epoch as well.

Of primary scientific, theoretical and ideological interest with regard to the history of philosophy, and Marxist history of philosophy in particular, is the elaboration and shaping of philosophical traditions associated with the emergence, spread and deep implanting in men's cultural experience of epoch-making philosophical doctrines constituting a great step forward in the history of philosophy, in the intellectual advance of mankind.

The formation of new philosophical traditions, in the course of which old traditions are replaced or reshaped, reflects fundamental changes in society, the growth and intensification of the class struggle, and embodies the essential requirements for the progress of science, philosophical and social thought.

A most vivid example of the formation, development and establishment of new philosophical traditions in the 19th-20th centuries is provided by the emergence and spread of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook which has received extremely wide scope for development in the present epoch thanks to the Great October Revolution, the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, the emergence of the world socialist system, and the growth of the international revolutionary movement. Around the revolutionary ideals and philosophical traditions of Marxism-Leninism there has developed an ever-growing ideological struggle between the forces of socialism and the forces of imperialism, which is exert-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 526.

** Ibid, pp. 185-86.

ing a considerable influence on the confrontation of ideas in the world labour movement and the emancipation movement at large.

The world communist movement is waging a constant ideological and political battle against anti-communism and reactionary bourgeois ideology which are spearheaded above all against Marxism-Leninism, as well as the freedom-loving and democratic traditions in social thought, materialist philosophical traditions, atheism, and dialectics.

The world communist movement upholds and furthers Marxist-Leninist ideological and philosophical traditions in an unrelenting struggle against both Right and "Left" revisionism, nationalistic distortions of Marxist philosophy and social thought, against a dogmatic approach to traditions or their nihilistic negation. In this connection, the greatest significance attaches to the fundamental and indissoluble unity of Marxist philosophical and revolutionary traditions with the creative, innovative Marxist approach to theory. This dialectical approach to the continuity of traditions is spearheaded against dogmatism which is alien to Marxism-Leninism and which consists in mechanical repetition of age-old truths regardless of fresh developments and modern scientific achievements, and against reactionary attempts to revive social and philosophical doctrines that have failed the test of time and proved untenable in practice. The Marxist-Leninist dialectical approach to tradition is also directed against shallow, nihilistic and negative attitudes towards man's intellectual heritage and towards the traditions of Marxism-Leninism, which are often rejected or questioned today by people who, under the pretext of injecting new blood into Marxism, proclaim it can be dovetailed with the latest bourgeois and petty-bourgeois trends of social thought, that are quite alien to Marxism.

The world communist movement resolutely defends the internationalist traditions of Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy, and comes out against the attempts to substitute for the integral scientific and revolutionary socialist world outlook, which finds a rich diversity of expression in different countries, national or regional "pluralistic" variants of Marxism, national "models of socialism", invariably terminating in a revision of the principles of the revolutionary

teaching of the working class, while that teaching is "integral in nature and belongs to all Communists, all revolutionary workers, all working people".

Addressing the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969, Leonid Brezhnev stated with good reason that "world socialism absorbs all the wealth and diversity of the revolutionary traditions and experience deriving from the creative activity of the working people of different countries.... Our Party constantly studies that experience and utilises everything of value that may be applied in the conditions obtaining in the Soviet Union... everything that really helps to strengthen the socialist system and embodies the general laws of socialist construction, which have been tested by international experience."***

Abandoning the internationalist principles of Marxism-Leninism, some writers abroad, would-be Marxists among them, claim that both in the past and still more so in the current period, the existence of "several Marxisms", of "several Leninisms" is quite in order. Thus, philosophical writings published abroad, certain articles by Zagreb philosophers in *Praxis* for instance, put forward revisionist concepts of the "crisis" and "stagnation" of Marxism, alleging that since the twenties many Communist parties have been following a mistaken path and that currently there exist "several kinds of Leninism", and so on. Revisionist interpreters of Leninism echo the words of Trotsky, enemy of Leninism, and bourgeois Marxologists—such as I. Fetscher, who, in defiance of historical truth, maintains in his *Von Marx zur Sowjetideologie (From Marx to the Soviet Ideology)* that in the twenties and thirties Leninism was replaced by so-called Stalinism and ceased to be a creative doctrine. They would have us believe that, ever since 1924, Leninism has been "distorted" and made into some sort of "codified Leninism". To this "codified Leninism" of their own invention they oppose other, allegedly "creative", concepts of Marxism, to wit, the anti-Leninist concepts of Trotsky, Bukharin, Lefebvre, Bloch, Marcuse, etc.

* *On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin*, Moscow, 1969, p. 6

** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 148.

Revisionist elements question and even deny any continuity of Marxist tradition in the world communist movement, in philosophy and theory, reviling the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties which defend the principles of revolutionary theory and develop it in present conditions. The renegade Garaudy, for example, has concocted a "theory" to the effect that in the context of the ideological struggle and controversy obtaining in the twenties and especially since the thirties and forties, in the Soviet Union and some other countries all creative development in Marxist philosophy ceased and gave way to "dogmatic stagnation". Thus the revisionists deny the historical truth that Marxist theory in the Soviet Union and other countries has at all stages been loyal to Leninism, followed Leninist traditions, and enriched itself with fresh works and fundamental propositions concerning major problems and branches of theoretical knowledge, including philosophical knowledge.

In the current epoch, Leninism has gripped the minds of millions, for whom it has become a world outlook, an earnest conviction, a guide to action. It has provided the theoretical and ideological foundation for priceless achievements of science and socialist culture. Lenin's doctrine has been enriched and substantiated by the historical experience of the working class and people of diverse countries as well as by the advance of the social and natural sciences and by the finest revolutionary and cultural traditions of many nations.

Since it embodies the varied experience of many nations, their finest revolutionary, cultural and philosophical traditions, Marxism-Leninism both was and is the essentially internationalist world outlook of the international revolutionary proletariat, the international science of the universal laws governing the development of being and knowledge. This is why Marxism is not to be split into parts, divided into "national variants" or expressed in isolated "national forms".

With reference to the growing diversity of the world revolutionary process, the Main Document of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in June 1969 in Moscow, points out that the triumph of the international proletariat over imperialism depends on the

consolidation of the communist movement on the basis of the international principles of Marxism-Leninism."

In our times, Communists, revolutionaries and builders of socialism are convinced more than ever of the lasting significance and vitality of Marxist-Leninist theoretical traditions. The most important of these traditions are the defence, consistent pursuit and creative development of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, such as proletarian internationalism; a class approach to social phenomena from the standpoint of the proletarian, socialist world outlook; the theoretical substantiation of the worldwide historical mission performed by the working class in abolishing capitalism and building socialism; Communist party leadership in the class struggle and the building of socialism and communism; unswerving adherence of theory to Party principles and uncompromising opposition to bourgeois ideology, opportunism and revisionism; close interdependence of all component parts of Marxism-Leninism; a creative approach to theory, the complete compatibility of scientific theory and the revolutionary practice of the communist transformation of the world. Historical experience has shown that these traditions and principles which extend to all components of Marxism-Leninism fully apply in the case of Marxist philosophy at every stage of its development.

At the same time, the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is characterised by distinct philosophical traditions which took shape in the course of the historical development of dialectical materialism as corollaries of its principles and expressions of its essence. Among such principles of the development of Marxist philosophy, the continuity of which has become a Marxist tradition, particular significance attaches to the unity of militant materialism and materialist dialectics—the scientific method of cognising and changing the world; a consistent struggle of materialism against idealism; a creative approach to philosophy, ready to alter the forms of Marxist philosophy or to replace one or another of its postulates by new propositions called for by changed social conditions and new scientific discoveries; the unity

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969.*

and independence of materialist philosophy and natural science. The unity and interdependence of all aspects of Marxist philosophy; continuity of development, which finds expression in the utilisation, substantiation and enrichment of philosophical concepts, categories and "conceptual material" adopted from the philosophy of the past and developed further at each new stage of the history of society and science; increasingly active theoretical study and its growing impact on man's practical efforts to change the world for the benefit of working people everywhere—these are the basic features and enduring traditions of Marxist philosophy. "Lenin always combined depth of scientific analysis of historical circumstances with the most resolute recognition of the significance of the revolutionary energy, initiative, class-consciousness and organisation of the masses, classes and parties, as well as the significance of the activity of individuals. His dialectical mind revealed new possibilities for expediting the revolutionary process in the operation of the subjective factor in conditions when general prerequisites for replacing capitalism by socialism are already ripe. Lenin teaches us that in such a situation the working people's readiness and ability to take revolutionary action, their class-consciousness, organisation and experience in struggle become decisive for the success of the revolution."^{*}

It is imperative that contemporary historians of philosophy make a detailed study of the development by Lenin and his followers of Marxist philosophy, in close connection with the practice of the revolutionary workers' movement, scientific progress and assimilation of the finest traditions of past philosophical thought.

* * *

The first Marxist research into traditions of the history of philosophy and social thought, of man's philosophical heritage, was carried out by Marx and Engels as early as the 1840s, particularly in *From the Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right*, *The German Ideology*, *The Holy Family*, *Theses on Feuerbach*, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, *The Poverty of Philosophy* and *Manifesto of*

* *On the Centenary of the Birth of U. I. Lenin*, pp. 15-16.

the Communist Party. Studies in the history of philosophical and social thought, begun by Marx and Engels, were continued by Plekhanov, Paul Lafargue, Franz Mehring and other 19th-century Marxists. They were comprehensively expanded and raised to a new and higher level in the 20th century by Lenin and his followers. The traditions handed down by Marx, Engels and Lenin with regard to the history of philosophy and their conception of the development of philosophy have provided the starting point for the Marxist philosophers of our times working on this concept and continuing the Lenin tradition in their approach to the philosophical and entire cultural heritage of mankind.

Of particular significance in this respect has been the theoretical work of Soviet Communists and Marxists in other countries during the era ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution, in particular following the 7th Comintern Congress, to promote the continuation and further elaborate progressive traditions in culture, philosophy and social thought, in their struggle against imperialism, reaction and fascism.

Leninist traditions and principles of research into the history of philosophy have provided the basis for the extensive scientific study and popularisation of the history of world philosophy and of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy carried on in the twentieth century in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as in some capitalist and third world countries.*

At the same time, there is no denying that many problems of Marxist history of philosophy, of considerable significance and topical interest, are still waiting to be solved, and that the struggle of ideas now going on in the international arena points to the pressing need for certain fundamental aspects of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy to be elaborated in more detail.

* See *History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-65; *Marx's 'Capital' and Philosophy Today*, Moscow 1968; *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965; *Modern Philosophy and Sociology in the Countries of West Europe and America*, Moscow, 1964 (All in Russian)

CHAPTER I

LENINISM AND MAN'S PHILOSOPHICAL HERITAGE

In the modern historical epoch, when the momentous process of the revolutionary transformation of the world is going on and the inspiring edifice of communist society is being erected, the cultural—and thus philosophical—heritage of the past comes to play a particularly significant role. "Absorbing and developing all the best that has been created by world culture, communist culture will be a new, higher stage in the cultural progress of mankind. It will embody the versatility and richness of the spiritual life of society, and the lofty ideals and humanism of the new world."¹

Marxism-Leninism, the highest achievement of scientific philosophical thought and the basis of the scientific socialist world outlook, has always been the ideological foundation of proletarian socialist culture, that is developing to become communist culture.

1. LENIN'S DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARXIST PRINCIPLES OF RESEARCH INTO THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Marxism-Leninism is a high point in the ideological-theoretical history of mankind from which it is possible to survey the entire past history of philosophical and sociological thought, discern its objective laws and discover new vistas of philosophical knowledge.

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 576-77.

The enormous significance of the history of philosophy for theory—above all, Marxist theory—was shown by Engels who wrote that “theoretical thinking is an innate quality only as regards natural capacity. This natural capacity must be developed, improved, and for its improvements there is as yet no other means than the study of previous philosophy”.^{*} Lenin lucidly expressed the Marxists’ attitude to the culture of the past in the following profound proposition which clearly numbers among valuable achievements of the history of philosophy. He wrote: “Marxism has won its historic significance as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat because, far from rejecting the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois epoch, it has, on the contrary, assimilated and refashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture. Only further work on this basis and this direction, inspired by the practical experience of the proletarian dictatorship as the final stage in the struggle against every form of exploitation, can be recognised as the development of a genuine proletarian culture.”^{**}

Marxist philosophy has revealed the nature of the historico-philosophical process and the laws to which it is subject, proving that the development of philosophical thought can only be understood correctly from the standpoint of the dialectical principle of historical method. Lenin wrote: “The whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system, demands that each proposition should be considered (α) strictly historically, (β) only in connection with others, (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history.”^{***}

Marxism views the history of philosophy as a dynamic process involving the emergence, elaboration and solution of *philosophical problems*, above all, fundamental problems such as the relation of thinking to being, man’s relation to the world, and the general laws of being and cognition, problems that constitute an integral part of philosophy’s subject-matter.

Marx and Engels refashioned from a materialist stand-

* F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 42-43.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 317.

*** Ibid., Vol. 35, p. 250.

point Hegel's proposition that the history of philosophy is a law-governed process, and demonstrated that the development of philosophy is based on changes occurring in the material life of society. They pointed out the dialectical nature of the history of philosophy, which manifests itself in the struggle between materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphysics, and in the contradictions between the content and form of philosophical doctrines, between the content of philosophical thought and its expression in philosophical concepts and categories, and so on.

The works of Marx, Engels and their followers supply a scientific explanation of the continuity in the development of philosophical ideas, resulting from the historical links between the social relations obtaining in different epochs of world history and from the continuity in revolutionary and other social movements.

Marxism also subjected to scientific analysis the interrelation and interaction of philosophy and other forms of social consciousness: science, art, morals, political and legal thought, religion and atheism.

Marxism-Leninism does not reduce the functions of the history of philosophy to the study, description, analysis and evaluation of philosophical doctrines past and present, although elucidation of the cognitive and analytical function of philosophical ideas is certainly indispensable to a scientific study of the history of philosophy. Marxist history of philosophy approaches both past and present philosophical doctrines as components of man's cultural experience. It singles out the contribution made by philosophical doctrines and traditions to the ideological struggle, supporting progressive traditions and opposing the utilisation of some philosophical doctrines of the past in the interest of modern reactionary forces; in this way the history of philosophy performs an important ideological function. Critical reworking of the "conceptual material" of the past and thorough investigation of the objective laws governing the development of philosophy, as a specific form of scientific cognition, and of its results and conclusions for the purpose of elaborating philosophical problems creatively and in an up-to-date scientific way, are also essential functions of the Marxist history of philosophy. This synthetical, methodological and, to a great extent,

heuristic function of the Marxist history of philosophy acquires paramount significance in an age of scientific progress and rapid expansion of scientific information in the second half of the 20th century.

Pointing out the close connection between the achievements of science (including philosophy) and its history Engels wrote in his *Umrisse zu einer Kritik der Nationalökonomie (A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy)*: "... science advances relatively to the amount of knowledge it has inherited from previous generations. . . ."

History of philosophy is not a descriptive science: like other branches of philosophy, it deals with the basic processes of development, their common patterns and their interdependence—in this case, with respect to philosophy itself. Marx first drew attention to this function in his early works, writing that "... in the history of philosophy there are nodal points which raise philosophy, in itself to concretion, apprehend abstract principles in a totality, and thus break off the rectilinear process."***

Contrary to idealistic theories, which claim that philosophy develops as a result of the "filiation of ideas" and is allegedly independent of social reality, and contrary to subjectivist concepts deducing philosophical thought merely from the philosopher's will, desires and personal inclinations, Marxism has discovered the internal objective laws governing the historical process of philosophical development.

Marxists have demonstrated that philosophy, like other forms of social consciousness, develops in conformity with *general* sociological laws. Like other social processes, the history of philosophy is conditioned, in the last analysis, by the economic needs of society and development of the mode of material production; it reflects the struggle of the classes in class societies; it develops in the course of communication and exchange between different peoples, and so on. Engels had every reason to observe: "... philosophers were by no means impelled, as they thought they were, solely by the force of pure reason. On the contrary, what really pushed

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 1, S. 521.

** Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Ergänzungsband, 1. Teil, S. 214

them forward most was the powerful and ever more rapidly crushing progress of natural science and industry."²

Marxist history of philosophy also explains the *particular* patterns of development of social consciousness, which are also relevant in relation to philosophy, such as the uneven development of different forms of social consciousness in different countries; the continuity in the development of social consciousness and the assimilation of its results; the relative independence of consciousness in relation to social reality, and so on. Marxist history of philosophy has demonstrated that the relative independence of ideologies manifests itself in philosophy in the "active aspect of human thought", i.e., in the theoretical explanation of the basic objective laws governing the development of the real world and, on this basis, in the active influence of philosophy—together with other forms of social consciousness—on the material basis of society, on the class struggle and development of social relations.

At the same time Marxism also discloses the inner logic of the development of philosophical thought and the *specific* laws governing the historical process of the development of philosophy itself. The specific pattern to be observed in the development of philosophy consists, above all, in the fact that there continues throughout the history of philosophical thought—for all its complicated turns, zigzags and even deviations from the truth—a progressive process of philosophical cognition the subject of which differs from those with which other branches of science are concerned in that it concentrates above all on the most general laws of being and cognition, on the relation of thinking to being, of man to the world, and on other strictly philosophical issues.

The specific pattern of development to be observed in philosophy in the course of its history comes out also in the fact that its content, which is continually being enriched and perfected, and the changing and often diametrically opposed treatment of philosophical problems by different schools, are expressed in general philosophical concepts, in categories which are modified or imbued with new meaning and are

² K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, pp. 347-48.

either adopted or rejected by the philosophers who come afterwards. Thus the continuous development of "conceptual material", which is a characteristic feature of the history of ideologies and that of every form of social consciousness, reveals itself in philosophy in a specific way."

Applying dialectics to the history of philosophy Marxism explains the increasing degree to which philosophical thought is fathoming the essence of the world and the process of human cognition, the progression of cognition from phenomenon to essence and from essence of the "initial order" to a deeper essence, to a law, the correlation between philosophical categories, their overlapping and "interplay", and so on.

The specific pattern inherent in the development of philosophical thought also embraces the following contradictory process. In the course of the history of philosophy the philosophical cognition of nature, society and human thought itself extends and becomes more complex, universal relationships and patterns of the development of phenomena are disclosed, and philosophical knowledge is enriched by new "grains" of absolute truth, which give rise to a more intricate but at the same time more correct and accurate scientific and philosophical picture of the world. On the other hand, in the course of the historico-philosophical process there "branch out" from general philosophical knowledge specific sciences, which investigate the common objective laws governing certain forms of development, certain aspects of the objective world and knowledge, i.e., sciences which remain basically philosophical but which treat a more limited subject (psychology, logic, sociology, aesthetics, ethics and so on).

The internal dialectical contradictions inherent in the historical development of philosophy find expression in the qualitative changes occurring in philosophical thought, in the appearance of new philosophical doctrines and trends that differ substantially, and sometimes radically from the previous path of philosophy. Such radical, qualitative changes constituting revolutions in philosophy, prepared for by the development of philosophical cognition, are closely linked with major upheavals in world history—social revolutions,

* K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol 3, p. 372.

revolutions in science and technology—and they either precede such revolutions or supplement and consolidate them.

At the end of the 19th century and in the 20th century, the scientific theory and methodology of the history of philosophy, derived from the fundamental ideas of Marx and Engels and their dialectical-materialist world outlook, was enriched and developed in the light of new historical conditions by Lenin, his disciples and followers.

Lenin first began to develop the Marxist conception of the history of philosophy in the 1890s (*What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book, A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism, Frederick Engels, The Heritage We Renounce, Our Programme*, etc.). This concept was further developed still more comprehensively and profoundly in Lenin's philosophical works: *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Marxism and Reformism, Philosophical Notebooks*, "Karl Marx", "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", etc. Lenin specified Marx and Engels' propositions to the effect that, in the final analysis, the development of philosophy is shaped by the development of society's economic basis, by its material production, yet is relatively independent at the same time. He stressed the active aspect of human thought, its ability not only to reflect objective reality but also, to some extent, to "create" it, i.e., to determine, in the process of practical activity, ways of transforming reality on the basis of knowledge of the objective laws that govern it. While expounding the dialectical-materialist reflection theory, Lenin approached the history of human philosophical thought as a reflection of the objective world and also as a historically developing, active intervention of man's practical activities and thinking in the development of the world.

Leninism continues the scientific analysis of the historical stages of the progress of philosophy and of the main forms and types of materialism and dialectics, which was started by Marx and Engels. Thus, Engels' definition of the two principal forms of pre-Marxist materialism is supplemented by Lenin's ideas on the evolution of the revolutionary democrats' materialist philosophy which, as expounded by Herzen, Chernyshevsky and other eminent thinkers, came

close to dialectical materialism, stopping short of historical materialism. Modern Marxist philosophers show that this philosophy was another historical kind of pre-Marxist materialism, characteristic of progressive social thought in countries passing from feudalism to capitalism, such as Russia in the nineteenth century.

On the basis of materialist dialectics, Marxist philosophers single out in the history of philosophy, in the sequence of various forms of materialism and dialectics, in the continuity of philosophical ideas and concepts, the effect of the law of the negation of negation. The development of philosophical thought is a process resembling spiral motion in the course of which some "circles" of philosophical knowledge are negated by other "circles". They pass into a new qualitative state and preserve all of the most valuable features acquired in previous, already disrupted "circles". With reference to the parallel Hegel drew between the history of philosophy and a circle Lenin wrote in his *Philosophical Notebooks*: "A very profound correct comparison!! Every shade of thought = a circle on the great circle (a spiral) of the development of human thought in general."*

Interpreting in his "On the Question of Dialectics" Hegel's idea of "circles" in the history of philosophy from a materialist point of view, Lenin has in mind that the highest stage of the progress of philosophical thought at any particular period (i.e., Heraclitus' philosophy in antiquity) is the nodal point on the disrupted circle or the spiral of philosophical development and the starting point of another "circle", in that instance, for the philosophy of the Renaissance and of the modern period (e.g., Descartes), which is, in turn, a negation of mediaeval scholasticism and a kind of "reversion" to the dialectics and materialism of the ancient Greeks, i.e., a negation of the negation.

Lenin and his followers evolved the Marxist principle of commitment in philosophy and applied it to modern philosophical thought, proving that, despite the abundance of idealistic philosophical schools in the 20th century and their epistemological scholasticism, struggle in philosophy—the struggle between materialism and idealism—is an inevitable

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 247.

feature of the development of philosophy, and this struggle is becoming still more acute as a result of the growing antagonism between the classes with whose interests and policies the philosophy of the moribund imperialist bourgeoisie and the philosophy of the increasingly powerful revolutionary proletariat building a socialist system are associated.

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other philosophical works written during the period of reaction which set in after the first Russian revolution (*Marxism and Revisionism*, *Those Who Would Liquidate Us*, *The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion*, etc.) Lenin made a rigorously scientific and simultaneously committed study of the history of philosophy. With every justification he opened his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* with a brief review of the contemporary struggle of materialism and idealism, with an excursion into the background of that philosophical struggle, leading up to the conclusion that philosophy was as committed in modern times as it had been 2000 years earlier, and stating that the history of philosophy had always involved a struggle between materialism and idealism.*

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin subjected to conclusive, scientifically substantiated criticism not only the theories propagated by contemporary enemies of Marxism, such as the Machists, "empirio-monists", neo-Kantians, "immanentists", pragmatists and similar "recent" currents of idealism but also the classical idealist philosophical systems (Berkeley, Hume, Kant, etc.) that had furnished the foundation for the theories of modern philosophers.

While the ideologists of the West European bourgeoisie and Russian bourgeoisie of the 20th century renounced the materialist and atheistic traditions of their own national heritage, heaping slander on the French 18th-century and Russian 19th-century materialists (as, for instance, the vile aspersions cast on Belinsky and Chernyshevsky in the Constitutional-Democrat journal *Vekhi* [*Landmarks*]), Lenin proved that precisely the revolutionary proletariat and the Marxist parties were the genuine heirs of all the valuable achievements of man's philosophical thought.

Lenin valued highly the traditions of pre-Marxist mate-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 22-39, 358.

rialism and atheism which served to promote the struggle against religion and idealism in his day. At the same time he emphasised the fundamental difference that existed between Marxist materialism and proletarian atheism, on the one hand, and bourgeois materialism and atheism of previous centuries on the other. In his article "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion" he wrote that the bourgeois materialists believed that religion kept its hold on the people because of its ignorance and therefore considered their principal duty to be the spread of education, knowledge and atheism, while the Marxists considered this culture-mongering view narrow. The Marxists demonstrated that the roots of religion and idealism lie in the social oppression to which the masses are subjected by the blind forces of capitalism, and, for their part, the Marxists subordinate anti-religious struggle to the class struggle of the proletariat, since their goal is to destroy the very system which engenders religion and idealism. This alone gave Lenin adequate grounds for criticising "god-searchers" and "god-builders", "empirio-monists" and other fellow-travellers of the workers' movement from among bourgeois intellectuals, who vainly sought to create a "new philosophy" (referred to by some as a "new religion") that would be "above" philosophical controversy, "above" materialism and idealism.

Lenin pointed out the essence of the distortions in the history of philosophy, perpetrated by the Machists who glossed over and tried to conceal the link between the "latest" philosophical trends (Machism, pragmatism, empirio-monism, empirio-symbolism, etc.), idealist systems of the past (Berkeley, Hume, etc.), and the overtly theological trends to be observed in modern times. In addition, the Machist falsifiers of the history of philosophy tried to reduce modern scientific materialism—Marxism—to the level of the metaphysical materialism of the past which failed to explain the discoveries made in natural science in the 19th-20th centuries. From this the Machists concluded that materialism was "refuted" and declared Machism, which was linked merely with one of the schools of modern physics, to be the "philosophy of modern science".

In his references in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* to the traditions of the materialist trend in philosophy and its

struggle against the idealist trend, Lenin provided the supporters of the scientific world outlook, and in particular the most consistent among them, the Marxists, with vital ideological weapons. Lenin warned Communists that they must have a critical approach to the bourgeois world outlook and should by no means be tolerant of idealism, preached by the bourgeois intellectuals.

Both philosophy and political economy, Lenin pointed out, are sciences with partisan implications, and bourgeois professors—economists and philosophers—are “educated salesmen” of the capitalist class.

The Marxists’ aim, Lenin wrote in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, is “to master and refashion the achievements of these ‘salesmen’ . . . and to be able to lop off their reactionary tendency, to pursue our own line and to combat the whole line of the forces and classes hostile to us”.*

The Leninist stage in the history of philosophy is characterised by a constant struggle both against bourgeois objectivism in philosophy, which seeks to stand “above” the antagonistic classes and parties in philosophy, and against relativism and subjectivism, conducive to a nihilistic denial of the finest of man’s philosophical achievements. Unlike relativism, which denies the existence of objective truth, and so denies the possibility of its comprehension in the course of the historical development of philosophy, Lenin’s approach proceeded from the indisputable fact that philosophical cognition, like any scientific cognition, develops in a complex and contradictory way, overcoming errors and mistakes, and, in the process of its development, arrives at objective truth. He wrote: “Cognition is the eternal, endless approximation of thought to the object. The reflection of nature in man’s thought must be understood not ‘lifelessly’, not ‘abstractly’, not devoid of movement, not without contradictions, but in the eternal process of movement, the arising of contradictions and their solution.”**

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *Philosophical Notebooks* and other works Lenin formulated, systematised and, with reference to a wealth of factual data, elaborated

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 343.

** Ibid., Vol. 38, p. 195.

the Marxist methodological principles of the history of philosophy.

The principles of Marxist-Leninist research into the history of philosophy imply that the following main requirements formulated by Lenin in the Conclusion of *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* must be met: 1) the theoretical foundations of a particular school of philosophy must be compared with those of dialectical materialism "*along the whole line of epistemological problems*"; 2) the place of this school in relation to other modern schools must be determined together with the course of its development; 3) the connection between the given school of philosophy and certain trends in natural science and the level of the latter must be ascertained; 4) the struggle between materialism and idealism must be brought out, since in the final analysis, this reflects the tendencies and ideology of the antagonistic classes in modern society.*

When treating these principles later on in the *Philosophical Notebooks* and other works, Lenin incorporated into the Marxist concept of the history of philosophy the propositions that "in logic, the history of thought *must*, by and large, coincide with the laws of thinking",** that dialectics is the result, sum and corollary of cognition of the world, and that the history of philosophy must sum up dialectically the end-results of the history of other branches of science.

In *Philosophical Notebooks*, the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" and other works, Lenin charted a vast programme for the investigation and development of man's philosophical thought and its supreme achievement, dialectical materialism; the focal point of this programme is Lenin's proposition: "The history of thought from the standpoint of the development and application of the general concepts and categories of the Logic—voilà ce qu'il faut!" (this is what we want—*Ed.*)***.

"Tracing the dialectical in the history of philosophy"—the study and development of the traditions of dialectical thought, of the dialectical concepts and categories contained

* Ibid., Vol. 14, pp. 357-58.

** Ibid., Vol. 38, p. 318.

*** Ibid., p. 177.

in the doctrines of Aristotle, Leibnitz, Hegel, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and other thinkers; materialist refashioning of the dialectical ideas of the past from a Marxist standpoint; application of materialist dialectics to modern history and the achievements of modern science—is a characteristic feature of the Leninist stage in the history of philosophy.

This stage was marked by a further extension of the range of the history of philosophy which came to include philosophical and sociological doctrines that neither had, nor in some cases could have, been subjected to all-round scientific analysis in the works of Marx and Engels. Lenin subjected to historical-philosophical analysis the doctrines of some 19th-century Russian materialist philosophers (Herzen, Chernyshevsky and others); the highly involved and contradictory views of ideologists of the peasantry, such as Lev Tolstoy, the Narodniks, etc.; the philosophical and social preoccupations in the ideology of national liberation movements, for instance, in the views of the Chinese revolutionary democrat, Sun Yat-sen, and other thinkers of the 19-20th centuries.

Lenin subjected to scientific analysis the connection between different philosophical trends and the revolution in natural science, which took place at the turn of the century. This analysis of the attempts by bourgeois idealist philosophers to make use of the latest discoveries of natural science demonstrates that the spontaneous materialistic tendency in natural science cannot by itself resist the pressure of philosophical idealism, and that it is necessary to pass from natural-scientific materialism to a higher stage of materialist ideology—to aware and militant dialectical materialism. This incontrovertibly proves the conclusion which Engels drew—a conclusion highly significant for the history of philosophy—that with every epoch-making scientific discovery materialism changes its form.

Lenin and his disciples singled out the fundamental stages, historical peculiarities and principal objective laws of development of dialectical and historical materialism and proved that it is an integral and well-balanced system of philosophical views which is always valid and constantly enriched by practical experience of revolutionary struggle and socialist construction, and by the epoch-making triumphs of science.

2. LENIN'S STRUGGLE TO CHAMPION MAN'S PHILOSOPHICAL HERITAGE AND ITS FINEST TRADITIONS

The problem of mastering man's philosophical heritage, of its correct evaluation and critical reshaping was always in the forefront of Lenin's attention and that of his followers and it is a subject in which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist parties show constant concern. Lenin started out from the fact that the working class and its parties had two dialectically interrelated tasks: to destroy the world of exploitation and expose the ideology justifying that world, on the one hand, and to build a new social system and culture by absorbing all genuine values of human culture, on the other.

In his early works, written in the 1890s, such as *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, *A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism*, *The Heritage We Renounce*, and others, Lenin had repeatedly stressed the significance of continuity in the development of philosophy, social thought and culture, showing that Marxism had inherited the finest traditions of human culture. Lenin always took a concrete historical approach to the philosophical and social doctrines of the past.

In carrying on the fight started by Marx and Engels against vulgar sociology and anti-historicism Lenin demonstrated, for instance, that the ideologists of the progressive bourgeoisie, the 18th-century Enlightenmenters, who sincerely believed in the advent of general prosperity after the fall of feudalism and the monarchical state, much as their views were historically limited and often erroneous, were not at that time pursuing any selfish class interests or seeking to distort facts.

In his *A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism* Lenin, using the example of Sismondi and other economists of the era of emergent capitalism, pointed out that "...historical services are not judged by the contributions historical personalities *did not make* in respect of modern requirements, but by *the new contributions they did make* as compared with their predecessors".*

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 185-86.

In his "In Memory of Herzen", "The Peasant Reform" and the Proletarian-Peasant Revolution", "Concerning U'ekhi" and other articles on the Russian materialist philosophy of the 19th century, Lenin showed that the social-political and philosophical views of 19th-century Russian materialists were very closely linked with the emancipation struggle against tsarism and serfdom and with the historical conditions obtaining in Russian society. Exposing the bourgeois Constitutional Democrats' allegations about the "groundlessness" of Belinsky's and Chernyshevsky's "highbrow outlook" Lenin proved that the views of these great Russian thinkers reflected the interests and hopes of the serfs.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, as well as in other works of that period, Lenin treated in further detail the Marxist views on philosophical heritage.

In doing so, Lenin, who consistently pursued and developed the materialist dialectical method, disclosed the real contradictions inherent in the philosophical heritage of the past and in modern philosophy and social thought. He also disclosed similar contradictions in the teachings of the 18th-century Enlighteners, Russian revolutionary democrats, Narodniks and other 19th-century philosophers. Describing the views and work of Lev Tolstoy, Lenin, unlike Plekhanov, who claimed that Tolstoy was a poor philosopher though an excellent writer, called attention to the contradiction inherent in both the views and work of Tolstoy, pointing out that Tolstoy's legacy contained, alongside ideas rooted in the distant past (the views of the patriarchal peasantry, "non-violent resistance", etc.), other elements highly relevant to the future, incisive criticism of the social order based on exploitation and all that it engenders. Lenin considered that the elements of criticism in Tolstoy's work, exposing the old social system, were capable of enlightening the progressive class.

The line Lenin pursued with respect to man's cultural heritage even in the pre-revolutionary period clashed with petty-bourgeois nihilistic concepts of "proletarian culture", advanced by Bogdanov, Shulyatikov and certain other "Left" revisionists. According to their vulgarised, sectarian views, the proletariat would be unable to resist the ideology of the classes hostile to it, should it absorb the intellectual

produced by the ideologists of other classes. Lenin repudiated these and similar attempts by those seeking to vulgarise Marxism to deduce proletarian ideology directly from the development of productive forces, from technology and the workers' industrial activity. He criticised severely the conceptions put forward by Shulyatikov, who, in his book entitled *Uvindication of Capitalism in West European Philosophy from Descartes to Mach* (1905), sought to represent the entire West European philosophy of the 17th-19th centuries, idealist and materialist alike, as nothing but a hymn to capitalism. Lenin resolutely repudiated Shulyatikov's assertions that all bourgeois philosophical systems without exception reproduce "with the aid of symbols" a picture of society's class structure, that they directly represent and support the capitalist system of production from the standpoint of its "organisers".

Lenin, who adopted a comprehensive and historical approach to the analysis of the social causes and conditions responsible for the emergence and development of philosophical doctrines, took into account the distinctive character of the historical development of individual countries, which enabled progressive schools of social and philosophical thought to anticipate to some extent these countries' socio-political progress. He came out against those conservative and reactionary ideologists of their own class whose philosophical views reflected its past or its already fading present.

Thus in his historical-philosophical excursion ("In Lieu of an Introduction") in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin, turning to the history of philosophy in the 18th century, pointed out that the idealist philosophy of Berkeley, the ideologist of the 18th-century reactionary British bourgeoisie, was offset by the materialist philosophy of Diderot and Holbach, the ideologists of the progressive French bourgeoisie of that period.*

Lenin emphasised in his works that the history of philosophical and social thought prior to Marxism yielded some valuable propositions and profound ideas which were critically assimilated, refashioned and amplified by Marxists.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, pp. 22-39.

In his article "Socialism Demolished Again", Lenin brilliantly summed up the process of continuous development of the philosophical and socialist ideas of the late 18th and early 19th centuries and the role it played in the historical preparation of the Marxist science of society. He wrote: "*Inasmuch* as this science was built up, first, by the classical economists, who discovered the law of value and the fundamental division of society into classes; *inasmuch* as important contributions to this science were made, in conjunction with the classical economists, by the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century in its struggle against feudalism and clericalism; *inasmuch* as this science was promoted by the historians and philosophers of the early nineteenth century who, notwithstanding their reactionary views, still further explained the class struggle, developed the dialectical method and applied it, or began to apply it, in social life—Marxism, which made tremendous advances along precisely this path, marks the *highest development* of Europe's entire historical, economic and philosophical science. Such is the logical deduction."^{*}

Lenin's line with respect to man's philosophical and entire cultural heritage was actively pursued and developed during the period following the October Revolution. This line was closely linked with the Party's policy in the sphere of cultural development, with Lenin's theory of culture and the cultural revolution, which he elaborated in his "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", "On Proletarian Culture", "Our Revolution" and some other works.

After the socialist revolution of 1917 the victorious proletariat and its party were faced with the problem of altering radically the people's ideology and cultural and philosophical attitudes, which before the revolution were often overtly religious and idealistic.

In the early years after October 1917 the victorious Russian working class had but few proletarian revolutionaries and intellectuals in its Party who had embraced Marxist philosophy. Most of the Russian professional philosophers were idealists; even the honest men among them, whose sympathies were with the people, natural scientists in particular,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 204.

were mostly materialists by instinct, and because of the class limitations of the intellectuals of the old school they did not understand dialectical materialism and on certain occasions attacked it.

The ideologists of the overthrown exploiting classes—theologists and theosophists, bourgeois professors, Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary publicists, and so on—depicted the proletariat as a wholly destructive force, incapable of building a new culture and shaping a new scientific ideology. Taking advantage of the inexperience of those running the young Soviet state, of the inadequate control exercised by the machinery of the proletarian dictatorship, which was just taking shape at that time, the ideologists of the overthrown reactionary forces of the landowners and bourgeoisie, the so-called *volnofily* (i.e., members of the Moscow Free Philosophical Society), bourgeois professors like Berdyayev, Frank, Lossky and others, openly propagated idealist and even mystical ideas, slandered Marxism, sought to represent communism as a destructive force, antagonistic to mankind's philosophical and cultural heritage.

The philosophy of the old world, like the entire superstructure of the latter, did not vanish as soon as the old political system had been overthrown and the economic system radically reorganised; it fiercely opposed the socialist revolution and continued for some time to poison by its blighting influence considerable sections of the intelligentsia and certain other strata in part. In that situation it would have been disastrous for the cultural-ideological front of the young Soviet state to open the door to unrestricted propaganda of bourgeois ideology, to competition from its various "schools" and to let the poisonous "flowers" of an ideology hostile to socialism blossom forth.

Lenin and the Bolsheviks chose a different path—uncompromising ideological struggle against the bourgeois world outlook so as to oust the ideology of the reactionary bourgeoisie from philosophy and sociology.

During the early post-revolutionary period, Lenin and the Communist Party also had to contend with petty-bourgeois sectarian "radicalism", with its wholly nihilistic attitude to man's cultural, and also philosophical, heritage. This nihilism and sectarian "radicalism" manifested themselves in the

views of Bogdanov and other *Proletkult* (Proletarian Culture) ideologists, as well as in the writings of Minin and other disorientated Marxists

S. Minin, in an article published in the journal *Pod znamenem marksizma* (*Under the Banner of Marxism*), from the standpoint of vulgar sociology advanced a system of views negating man's philosophical heritage and philosophy in general as an independent science. "Philosophy is the pillar of the bourgeoisie," he wrote. "Not merely idealist or metaphysical philosophy, but philosophy in general, philosophy as such. The content of this concept is singularly broad, ranging from spiritualism, i.e., religion once again, to... Marxism. Philosophy is half-faith, half-knowledge, half-revelation, half-science. Or rather, philosophy is more faith than knowledge, it is closer to religion than to science.... Science is unconditionally monistic, while philosophy is dualism or, worse still, eclecticism. This is perfectly natural since philosophy is the spiritual off-print of the bourgeoisie, the quintessence of its class 'spirit'. Philosophy brings us the hopes and fears of the bourgeoisie's soul and that of the capitalists, the supporters of constitutional monarchy or the monarchic republic."*

This sectarian, vulgar-nihilistic attitude to philosophy, including Marxist philosophy had something in common with bourgeois conceptions of the liquidation of scientific philosophy. Such a denial of the independence of philosophy could well be supported, just as it still can today, by the positivists as well, who assert that in our age philosophy is being completely ousted by science.

Bogdanov's "cultural-philosophical conception", which was supported in the twenties by other *Proletkult* ideologists (e.g., by the leader of the movement, V. Pletnev, whose views were criticised by Lenin), was a subtly disguised variety of vulgar-nihilistic petty-bourgeois radicalism.

Any non-proletarian culture, any old philosophical system is, according to Bogdanov, alien to the "collective-labour point of view" and can only be an expression of an "authoritarian" or "individualistic" standpoint.

* S. Minin, "Down with the Philosophy!", *Pod znamenem marksizma*, No. 5-6, 1922, p. 128.

Old culture, including the entire philosophy of the past, being incapable of asserting the "collective-labour point of view", could, according to Bogdanov, only send the proletariat in a direction opposite to that which would serve its true interest and corrupt it.

Taken to its logical conclusion, this conception unavoidably resulted in a nihilistic attitude to man's philosophical heritage, the more so as Bogdanov long before, as early as 1904 when he had written his *Empirio-Monism*, entertained a relativist view, with respect to the history of philosophy as well, believing that Marxism contained a denial of the objective nature of any truth whatsoever, that it denied "eternal truths".

Bogdanov expounded this subjective-idealist conclusion in his *Faith and Science*, written in 1910 and spearheaded against Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

The nihilistic attitude to past culture, including man's philosophical heritage, propagated by Bogdanov and the *Proletkult*, Minin and some other authors, was able for some time after October 1917 to find support not only among petty-bourgeois intellectuals but also among workers of insufficient political maturity.

During periods of revolutionary upheaval, when the hatred of the oppressed for their oppressors reaches its utmost limit, this hatred is sometimes mistakenly directed against all that is associated with the oppressing class, including the science, art treasures, philosophical doctrines, and so on.

In the struggle to defend a correct, Marxist attitude to man's cultural heritage—including the philosophical heritage—Lenin's theoretical stand and policy in the field of culture was actively supported by other Party and government leaders, scientists, prominent figures from the world of culture, etc.

Lunacharsky, who, before the revolution, had committed grave errors in matters concerning philosophy and culture, for which Lenin had criticised him, after the October Revolution took an active part in the measures introduced to create a high-level socialist culture in the Soviet Union and promote the triumph of the scientific world outlook. Criticising narrow sectarian and vulgarising quasi-innovation Lunacharsky wrote: "To declare, from the point of view of the

new art, important as its content may be, 'Provided the sense is good and the class approach adequate, the rest will take care of itself', is to spike one's own guns. . . . The class approach to art does not consist in throwing away all the achievements of the class that went before and thinking that the proletariat . . . stands naked on the naked earth, has destroyed all, and unaided will create all."^{*}

Describing the dialectical negation, the critical reshaping of previous philosophy by Marx, Lenin wrote: "He critically reshaped everything that had been created by human society, without ignoring a single detail. He reconsidered, subjected to criticism, and verified on the working-class movement everything that human thinking had created, and therefrom formulated conclusions which people hemmed in by bourgeois limitations or bound by bourgeois prejudices could not draw."^{**}

Lenin singled out from man's philosophical heritage first and foremost its materialist and dialectical traditions which played an important role in modelling and developing the scientific, dialectical-materialist world outlook. In his writings, especially in the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", Lenin emphasised that it was necessary to popularise and utilise the valuable materialist and atheistic traditions of the 18th-century progressive French philosophers, and to further the materialistic tradition that had grown up in Russia.

The Russian materialist tradition was accorded its due place thanks to Lenin and the Party. Despite what Russian reactionaries asserted before the revolution and what the modern reactionaries abroad claim, now not only Soviet people but progressive circles in other countries are convinced that in philosophy, as in many other spheres, Russia was not a backward country at all, merely imitating the West, but, as Herzen pointed out, had made its own contribution to the treasure-house of world philosophy.

In some of his works Lenin provided a thoroughly scientific appreciation of the forerunners of Marxism—the rev-

^{*} A. Lunacharsky, *Articles on Soviet Literature*, Moscow, 1958, pp. 139, 146 (in Russian).

^{**} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 287.

olutionary enlighteners and democrats of the 19th century, showing that their finest traditions—irreconcilable opposition to serfdom, the striving after democratisation of society and the struggle for better conditions for the masses—were pursued still further in the changed historical situation by the Russian Marxists. He carefully selected and emphasised in the legacy of the great Russian revolutionary Chernyshevsky all that was of value in promoting the cause of democratic revolution (revolutionary democratism, the awareness of the antagonistic social relations in Russia and of the idea of the class struggle, the optimistic faith in the people, etc.). At the same time Lenin pointed to the utopian nature of the hopes that a peasant revolution in Russia would be socialist in character. These hopes were entertained by Chernyshevsky and his supporters, who stirred the Russian progressives to engage in a heroic struggle against autocracy.

The position shared by Lenin and other Russian revolutionary Marxists with respect to the ideological heritage of the Russian revolutionary peasant democrats vividly reflects the great concern of the vanguard of the proletariat, its Marxist Party, for preserving and utilising the "democratic kernel" of the popular peasant movement, for defending the peasants' interests and demands, for uniting in one revolutionary stream the proletarian movement against capitalism and the peasant movement against the vestiges of serfdom.

Lenin showed that the Marxists considered the issues raised by Russian social thinkers in the 1860s from the standpoint of the "dispossessed producers", i.e., the proletariat. He wrote: "Guarding the heritage does not mean confining oneself to the heritage, and the 'disciples' add to their defence of the general ideals of Europeanism an analysis of the contradictions implicit in our capitalist development, and an assessment of this development from the specific standpoint indicated above."^{*}

This fundamental observation sums up clearly the Communist approach to the traditions of philosophy and social thought and is fully relevant today.

^{*} Ibid., Vol 2, pp. 526-27.

Lenin's materialist refashioning of Hegel's dialectics is of particular significance for the future of philosophy, especially that of the dialectical tradition.

Lenin always, throughout his career (beginning with *What the "Friends of the People" Are...* and ending with "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", stressed the important progressive role played by dialectics in the world history of philosophy. He regarded the development of dialectics in the history of philosophy as a natural process leading up to the emergence of Marxist philosophy. In tracing the evolution of the dialectical element in the history of philosophy so as to develop the dialectical tradition, Lenin attached major importance to the role played by Aristotle in the history of philosophy. He showed, first, that, compared with his predecessors, Aristotle had done much to develop logic and dialectics, observing at the same time that "in Aristotle, objective logic is *everywhere confused* with subjective logic and, moreover, in such a way that everywhere objective logic is *visible*";* and, second, that Aristotle's ideas were a significant advance on Plato's idealism in that he tried to prove that it was impossible for the essence of a thing to be separated from the thing itself.

Lenin applied the principles of dialectics to the history of its development in the struggle against metaphysics. Lenin criticised Hegel for his philosophical idealism and reactionary views on a number of questions, and also emphasised the immense contribution Hegel made to the history of human thought by brilliantly divining, in the age of metaphysics, the universe as a process or development in which all being evolves, while however erroneously believing this process to be an emanation of the "absolute idea".

Lenin underlined the significance of Hegel's dialectics as one of the theoretical sources of Marxist philosophy and at the same time revealed the fundamental difference between Marxist materialist and Hegelian idealist dialectics, stressing that Hegel merely "divined", while Marx carried his ideas further, his study culminating in a comprehensive scientific theory. Lenin first pointed out the difference at an early stage of his theoretical work. At that time the liberal

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 368.

Narodniks sought to misrepresent Marxism as "Hegelianism" presumably forcing into its "abstract schemes", the "Hegelian triad" among them, the development of every nation, condemning all to a destiny like that experienced by the West European nations. At the same time they appropriated the great legacy of the Russian revolutionary democrats, and falsely described the Russian Marxists as people "without kith or kin", who allegedly renounced the "heritage of the sixties".

The "Legal Marxists", Russian and foreign Bernsteinians, who tried to turn the working-class movement into an appendage of the liberal bourgeoisie, injecting it with the poison of revisionism, maintained that Marxism had as yet no philosophy of its own and tried to provide it with a "philosophical foundation" in the form of Kantianism, substituting vapid reformist evolutionism for revolutionary Marxist dialectics. These opponents of dialectics, who excluded it from Marxist theory which they tried to adapt to the needs of the bourgeoisie and distorted in a revisionist spirit, contemptuously referred to dialectics as "scholasticism", a "Hegelian snare", etc. Lenin, on the other hand, as early as the nineties singled out the progressive, revolutionary implications of dialectics and elucidated the fundamental difference between dialectical materialism and all previous bourgeois philosophy.

In refutations of ideas put forward by Mikhailovsky, Struve, Bernstein and other opponents of Marxism, Lenin demonstrated that Marxist dialectics was the most consistent and comprehensive developmental doctrine, as was fully borne out by modern history and science. He wrote: "Here we have the stock method of accusing Marxism of Hegelian dialectics, an accusation that might be thought to have been worn threadbare enough by Marx's bourgeois critics. Unable to advance any fundamental argument against the doctrine, these gentlemen fastened on Marx's manner of expression and attacked the origin of the theory, thinking thereby to undermine its essence".*

Lenin showed that Marx's dialectics, unlike Hegel's triads and his other idealistic constructions, reflected the objective

* Ibid, Vol. 1, p. 163.

historical process of development of nature and society, that it called for a concrete historical approach to real phenomena and their cognition, and equipped the proletariat in its fight for the revolutionary transformation of the world. He pointed out that Marxist philosophy was radically different from the theories of bourgeois sociologists which were worthless "because of their basic methods, because of their solid unrelieved metaphysics"* (e.g., those of the positivists, the spiritual fathers of Narodnik subjective sociology). These sociologists sought through abstract speculation to establish the eternal and immutable laws governing the development of society, the eternal and immutable sources of social progress. Lenin wrote: "The gigantic step forward taken by Marx in this respect consisted precisely in that he discarded all these arguments about society and progress in general and produced a *scientific* analysis of *one* society and of *one* progress—capitalist."***

Lenin's detailed analysis of dialectics and its laws and categories in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, the article "Karl Marx", *Philosophical Notebooks* and other works and his brilliant definition of materialist dialectics as the result, sum and conclusion of the history of cognition put Lenin head and shoulders above the Second International theoreticians. Plekhanov among them, who paid insufficient attention to the development of materialist dialectics, often reducing it to a sum of examples and sometimes almost equating dialectical and pre-Marxist materialism.

The bourgeois Marxologists, who falsify Leninism, and revisionists, who follow in their footsteps, groundlessly assert that, unlike Marx, Lenin ignored Hegel's dialectics (in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* too) preferring Holbach's metaphysical materialism for a long time and that he only turned to Hegelian philosophy and dialectics after 1913.***

* V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 143

** Ibid., p. 145.

*** At the 12th International Congress of Philosophers (Venice, 1958), the American personalist R. T. Flewelling, delivering a paper *On Certain Prerequisites of Scientific Discovery*, in which he touched upon the history of Marxist philosophy, stated that the Marxists, being "confirmed materialists", had resorted to Hegelianism to "rescue static materialism". Flewelling then went on to assert that "nonetheless, they presumably

The history of the Marxist-Leninist philosophical doctrine testifies that neither Lenin nor Engels ever departed from the dialectical tradition elaborated by Marx from the standpoint of materialism or reverted in any way to Holbach or other pre-Marxist materialists: nor did Lenin ever "shift his ground" during World War I by reverting from materialism to Hegel.

Lenin wrote: "Marx and Engels always condemned *bad* (and, particularly, anti-dialectical) materialism; but they condemned it from the standpoint of a higher, more advanced, dialectical *materialism*, and not from the standpoint of Humism or Berkeleianism."^{*} This also applies to Lenin himself.

The fact that Lenin paid particular attention to the elaboration of Marxist dialectics during the war and after the October Revolution, does not mean in the least that he had set no store by the dialectical tradition or the Marxist dia-

remained dogmatists for they would no sooner renounce the material absolute than theologians would renounce God" (*Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Filosofia*, V. 6, Firenze, 1961, p. 120)

A certain Mr. Stern, who at the same congress delivered a paper entitled *Promulgation of Metaphysics*, tried to contrast Engels and Lenin, whom he described as dogmatists, with Marx, whom he graciously deigned to consider a dialectician. He asserted that Marx had believed in the fruitfulness of the dialectical approach but had never given it metaphysical status "such as we find in the writings of almost any Marxist writer, starting with Engels" (*Ibid.*, p. 465).

In his book *Marxism and Philosophy*, Gregor pursues a somewhat more subtle, though equally false and unsound, line of argument against dialectical materialism, claiming that there are two "trends" in Marxism. The first, an active trend, was present in Marx's early works, in which the young Marx made man a "creative element of cognition", and was, to a certain extent, to be found again in Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks*. The other trend, termed mechanistic, is represented by Engels, Plekhanov and Lenin (in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other works), who allegedly "return" to Holbach and make passive matter outside man their starting point, while man merely "photographs", "copies" and "reflects" this matter passively.

Similar views are put forward by Lefebvre and other revisionist apostates of Marxism, such as Roger Garaudy and Ernst Fischer, who falsely accuse both Lenin and Engels of having abandoned dialectics for metaphysical materialism, in which respect, too, they see eye to eye with Joseph Bocheński, Gustav Wetter, Sidney Hook and other anti-Communist philosophers.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 239.

lectical method at any previous time. When Lenin criticised the Narodnik ideologists in his first major work *What the "Friends of the People" Are...*, he explained the essence of Marx's dialectical method and elaborated it further by applying it to the interpretation of the socio-economic formation as an integral social organism. After the 1905 revolution when Lenin warded off attacks made by bourgeois idealist philosophers and revisionists against the materialist philosophical foundations of Marxism, and protected the working-class movement and scientists from falling under the influence of idealism, he defended and developed not just any materialism, but *dialectical* materialism and proved that materialist dialectics alone could offer a way out of the crisis natural science found itself in early in the 20th century and help disprove the idealist interpretations of the achievements of modern science. Lenin attached the utmost importance to the Marxist dialectical method, to the materialist interpretation of Hegel's dialectics, particularly during the period between the first and second revolutions in Russia, because both in the scientific world and the labour movement at that time the "idea of development" was interpreted in a vulgar-evolutionist and reformist way alien to dialectics, and it was necessary to substantiate philosophically the revolutionary activities of the working class and its party in the new epoch which the theoreticians of the Second International described as one of peaceful and gradual development. Lenin's article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", like his other works, has nothing to do with any return to Hegel, or with merely studying and applying his method; they deal with the examination and utilisation of Hegel's dialectics materialistically as interpreted and developed by Marxism, with the dialectics that Marx applied in *Capital*, and, therefore, with Marxist, materialist dialectics. As usual, Lenin bore in mind the fundamental difference between Marx's dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics. Lenin saw in the investigation and materialist interpretation of Hegel's dialectics a strong weapon for the struggle against mechanism and positivism current in natural science in the first quarter of the 20th century and against the "hackneyed idea of evolution", i.e., against vulgar evolutionism, reformism which Karl Kautsky and other theoreticians of the Sec-

and International spread among the ranks of the labour movement. In that connection, Lenin, in many of his works, especially in the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", urged Marxists to study Hegel's works systematically and interpret them from a materialist standpoint.

Thus, Lenin supplied classical examples of how to master the philosophical heritage of the past for the purpose of developing dialectical materialism and the entire Marxist doctrine which represents the supreme achievement of philosophical thought.

3. THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MARXIST-LENINIST VIEW ON MAN'S PHILOSOPHICAL HERITAGE AND MODERN BOURGEOIS CONCEPTS OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Lenin's scientific concept of research into mankind's philosophical heritage, which reflects the world outlook of the revolutionary working class, develops in the process of struggle against idealist concepts of the history of philosophy which express the ideology of the modern bourgeoisie.

Under the conditions of the new, third stage of the general crisis of capitalism experienced today by the imperialist countries, the far-reaching decay and degradation of bourgeois ideology have further aggravated the reactionary tendencies inherent in idealist philosophical systems and their concepts of the history of philosophy. The philosophical views of the ideologists of the modern bourgeoisie increasingly betray their reactionary features, viz., anti-communism, defence of the bourgeois system presented as the "welfare state", clericalism, extreme chauvinism, racialism leading to fascism, and so on. The reactionary spirit of modern bourgeois ideology increasingly determines its approach to the history of philosophy, to man's philosophical heritage. The modern ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie are exalting and modernising religious-mystic systems (Thomism, spiritualism, etc.), irrationalist doctrines (the philosophy of Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, etc.), racialist-nationalist and militarist "theories" (Nietzscheanism, Otto Ammon's sociology, and so on) and similar reactionary philosophical and sociological views of the past.

Modern bourgeois concepts of the history of philosophy, even if they contain a good deal of concrete historical material and original statements, possess no integral scientific system of ideas concerning the historical process of the development of human philosophical thought, no proper understanding of the objective laws and prospects of this development.*

Here we may touch on this point but briefly, of course. Many bourgeois historians of philosophy, who give voice to the reactionary tendencies in modern bourgeois ideology, look down on the history of philosophy, describing its finest achievements as the "shallow optimism of progress". At the same time, some contemporary bourgeois historians of philosophy (Johann Fischl, R. Harris and others) seek to contrast the modern scientific outlook, Marxism, with the idealist philosophical and sociological doctrines of bygone ages, wrongly depicting them as the "golden age" of mankind and maintaining that the philosophical ideas set forth in these doctrines are "imperishable" and merely need now to be somewhat modernised.

Even those of the modern bourgeois historians of philosophy, who attempt to adhere to the principle of historicism in philosophy, have proved incapable of sustaining a historical approach on the development of philosophical thought for, as they are still idealists, they ignore the main source of this development—change in the material life of society and the class struggle. So, Arthur Lovejoy attempts, in his work on the history of ideas, to deduce the distinctions between historical epochs from contemporary philosophical and other ideas, thus putting the cart before the horse. In his *History of Western Philosophy*, Bertrand Russell seeks to explain philosophical ideas from the predominant social at-

* Detailed theoretical analyses of modern bourgeois concepts of the history of philosophy have recently been carried out by various Marxist historians of philosophy, including *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, Part 2, Moscow, 1965, Chapter 8, §§ 5-6 and Chapter 11, 3; *The Philosophical Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2, pp. 376-87; M. V. Yakovlev, *Marxism and Modern Bourgeois History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1964; L. V. Skvortsov, *Is Metaphysics Getting Its "Second Wind"?* Moscow, 1966; *History of Philosophy: A Brief Outline*, Moscow, 1967, Ch. XX, § 5, Ch. XXI and Conclusion, T. Oizerman, *Problems of Historical-Philosophical Science*, Moscow, 1969; *Leninism and Problems of Historical-Philosophical Science*, Moscow, 1970, etc. (All in Russian)

attitudes of each given epoch, deducing these attitudes from the prevalence of certain philosophical ideas, thus landing in a vicious circle.'

The modern bourgeois concepts of the history of philosophy set forth by E. Lemann, Johannes Hirschberger, Hermann Glockner, Ralph Perry and others either deny to the history of philosophy any independent status or minimise it, often regarding philosophy as an appendage of religion inasmuch as the former is alleged to have for its subject "absolute reason", the essence of an eternal and infinitely necessary being, god, and so on. Some contemporary idealists, positivists in particular (Wittgenstein and others), argue that the history of philosophy never raised any independent problems of its own, while the entire purpose of philosophy has always been merely to interpret and "elucidate" the propositions and "language" of science. Phillip Frank, a positivist, who discarded the most valuable achievements of past philosophical thought, claimed, for instance, that modern science was incompatible with the traditional philosophical systems,** while another neo-positivist, Hans Reichenbach, writes that the history of philosophy is a history of the errors of men who asked questions which they had no means of answering.***

Criticising these erroneous, idealist views on the history of philosophy Marxist historians of philosophy point out that it is first and foremost reactionary ideologists who expose man's philosophical heritage to grave danger, since in dealing with the history of philosophy, they repudiate the close association existing between philosophy and science and exclude from philosophy materialism and atheism, rationalism and free-thinking. Pseudo-scientific, positivist concepts hold out danger no less grave to man's philosophical heritage: speaking on behalf of modern science, they treat with contempt the priceless achievements of human reason embodied in the philosophical doctrines of the past and present, calling in question the independence and cognitive value of progressive philosophical doctrines.

*B. Russell, *The History of Western Philosophy*, Moscow, 1959, p. 383.

** *Modern Science and Its Philosophy*, London, 1949, p. 41.

*** R Richta, *Civilizace na razcesti*, Praha, 1967, s. 117.

In the field of the history of philosophy, Leninism also contends with empiricism and subjectivism, characteristic of many bourgeois historical-philosophical concepts. While recognising the great role played by the philosopher's personality, convictions and inclinations in philosophical creative work, Leninists criticise the concepts of idealist historians of philosophy, who ignore the social foundation of philosophical ideas and deduce different types of world outlook merely from the "psychological make-up" of the individual.

At the present stage of historical progress, when bourgeois ideology is increasingly filled with pessimism and fear of the future, bourgeois historians of philosophy, especially existentialists (K. Jaspers, K. Schilling, etc.), maintain that world history of philosophy is a free sphere of thinkers' "self-expression", a sum total of their subjective "interventions" in the "eternal problems" engaging the attention of mankind, each philosopher creating a subjective "individual world" of his own, allegedly quite independent of the history of society, of the requirements of his age.

Openly reactionary philosophical and sociological "theories" of the imperialist bourgeoisie (fascism, racialism, Nietzscheanism, and so on) reject humanism and the philosophical and social doctrines in which humanistic ideas found expression in the past and attack communism, the genuine humanism of the present. On the other hand, Leftist sectarian elements of the labour and national liberation movements in some countries, failing to understand the revolutionary socialist significance of Marxist humanism and its indissoluble ties with the finest traditions of human thought, vociferously declare humanism to be synonymous with bourgeois liberalism, alleging that it is incompatible with revolution and communism, identifying the ideas of socialist humanism with bourgeois quasi-humanism, and so on.

Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought allows for the fact that there also exists in the current epoch yet another variety of modern bourgeois ideologists—the proponents of the so-called philosophy of man—who proclaim themselves to be humanists, heirs to the ideas of the great humanists, philosophers and sociologists of the past, although many of them at the same time deny that it is necessary to carry on a revolutionary struggle against the anti-humanist social

system of the present age, capitalism, which they would "reform".

Today, too, there are among philosophers and other academics in the capitalist world those who support the ideas of bourgeois-democratic humanism and oppose capitalist monopoly and reaction, aggressive wars and colonialism, even though they take no part in the communist movement and sometimes speak out against it. These contemporary supporters of bourgeois-democratic humanism (Bertrand Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, C. Wright Mills and others) usually share erroneous, idealist philosophical views. Even so, their views on philosophy and its history, despite their utterly erroneous idealist source, do differ from the retrograde theories of the imperialist reactionaries, complete with their nihilistic attitude to culture and philosophy.

They criticise the idealist philosophical position of the philosophers who express bourgeois humanist views, the idealist methodology in the history of philosophy and the inconsistency and narrowness of their humanism. Meanwhile the progressive forces of modern society, led by the international communist movement, regard them at certain historical stages as their allies, albeit unstable and inconstant ones, in the struggle against the domination of capitalist monopolies and imperialist reaction aimed at promoting extensive democracy and all-round cultural progress.

Many non-Marxist works on the history of philosophy present philosophy as the domain of "chosen", "philosophical" peoples (the Greeks, Romans, Germans and some other European peoples). This view was carried furthest of all in the "Eurocentrist" (or, more precisely, "Occidentrist") concept put forward by bourgeois philosophers and historians, according to which philosophy developed only in some Western countries while most peoples of the world, especially Eastern peoples, are "unphilosophical". If, however, philosophical thought does appear in the East, it still is, according to these concepts, religious-mystical, speculative, torpid, exclusive, "autocratic", and so on. An equally erroneous and retrograde point of view is to be found in the "Eastern-centrist" (or, more precisely, "Asia-centrist") bourgeois concept, according to which the Asian nations alone (India, China, the Arab countries of the Middle East, etc.) were and still

are charged with a particular historical, spiritual and philosophical mission, whereas European and American philosophical thought bound up with experimental natural science and political movements has allegedly become immersed in rationalism, empiricism and practicism and therefore, they say, has nothing to do with "genuine philosophising" (in a religious-ethical sense). While exposing the reactionary, nationalist essence of "Asiacentrism" which sometimes infiltrates the liberation movements of the Eastern peoples, Marxist science cannot deviate from historical truth and overlook the long tradition of the progressive trends in the philosophy and culture of the Eastern nations.

Marxist history of philosophy proves that philosophical thought originated in the East (Egypt, India, China, etc.), flourished with particular brilliance in ancient Greece and Rome, during the Middle Ages in the Arab countries, Spain and other West European countries, during the Renaissance and in the 16th-19th centuries in Western Europe, and in the 19th-20th centuries in Russia and other East European countries.

The course of the history of philosophical thought in different countries reflected the uneven nature of their social development. Not all peoples possessed in slave-owning, feudal and colonial societies the necessary prerequisites for the successful and all-round development of philosophy, which required a high level of scientific knowledge and public involvement in political life. This explains why philosophical and social doctrines playing a particularly important part in the development of world philosophical thought and paving the way for the scientific philosophy of Marxism could not spring up in every country. The main line of development of world philosophy ran from ancient Greek philosophy, whose doctrines contained in embryo subsequent varieties of world outlook, to materialism and dialectics in modern Western Europe, i.e., to the immediate sources of dialectical materialism, and from them to Marxism. Nevertheless, countries whose philosophical thought, by dint of specific historical circumstances (backwardness associated with serfdom, the absence of a revolutionary proletariat, and so on), had in the past not yet fallen in step with the main line of the development of world philosophy can by no means be exclud-

ed from the worldwide process of the history of philosophy. The progressive philosophical, sociological, aesthetic and ethical ideas that emerged and developed even at that stage in these countries, including Russia and other East European countries, and in some Asian countries etc., enriched man's philosophical thought, exerting a notable effect on the development of their own national culture and that of neighbouring peoples and, consequently, on world culture, science and social thought.

Unlike some bourgeois concepts of the history of philosophy, which propound the objective-idealist view of the "filiation of ideas", according to which the development of philosophy is a spontaneous and self-contained thought-process, independent of the history of society and science, Marxist historians of philosophy proceed in their works from a dialectical-materialist interpretation of Hegel's thesis that philosophy is an "epoch grasped by thought". They trace the close connection between philosophical ideas and the progress of society and science and—in the last analysis—their dependence on the latter.

While the idealist historians of philosophy ignore or belittle materialist philosophy, the Marxist historians of philosophy turn not only to the traditional and "primordial", chiefly idealist, systems but also to those materialist doctrines, tendencies and ideas that have been consigned to oblivion by bourgeois historiography. Marxist history of philosophy also gives an objective, scientific appraisal of idealist philosophical doctrines, explaining the theoretical quests of the idealist philosophers and discovering the "rational kernels" in their treatment and solution of philosophical problems and their elaboration of philosophical categories.

Marxist historians of philosophy provide a precise definition of the subject-matter of the history of philosophy. Whereas during the philosophical discussions, held in the Soviet Union in 1947, as well as in some works on the history of philosophy, the cognitive aspect was passed over and underestimated, more recent Marxist works show that the history of philosophy does not consist entirely in the struggle between materialism and idealism, dialectics and metaphysics, although this struggle largely determines the content of the historical-philosophical process. In our view the subject-

matter of the science of the history of philosophy is the historical and law-governed process of the development of philosophical thought, whose principal content is the advance and enrichment of philosophical knowledge. In the course of this process, solutions are provided for diverse philosophical problems arising in the course of socio-historical developments. In the history of philosophy radical changes have taken place resulting in transitions from one stage to another, qualitatively different stage and marking turning-points in peoples' social and cultural experience. None of the radical changes in the history of philosophy, resulting in one stage being replaced by another, was a real, genuine revolution in philosophy capable of bringing forth a philosophy that could hold sway over the minds of the advanced revolutionary classes, of the masses, and inspire them to a revolutionary transformation of nature and society.

It was Marxism that provided a philosophy that could become the banner of the leading revolutionary class, the proletariat, overthrow old, obsolete practices and build communism. It was thanks to Marx that the first real revolution in philosophy took place.

Marxism emphasises the "key points" with respect to independently developing philosophical knowledge, characterised by the emergence and development of epoch-making philosophical doctrines (the philosophy of the ancient East; the philosophy of the ancient Greeks and Romans; the philosophy of the Renaissance; 16th-18th-century materialism; classical German philosophy of the late 18th and early 19th centuries; the materialist philosophy of 19th-century revolutionary democracy; the emergence of Marxism which represented a revolutionary change in philosophy; Leninism as a new stage in the development of Marxism and its philosophy).

The Marxist historians of philosophy trace out the development and sequence of the main historical forms of materialism and dialectics: 1) the naive materialism of antiquity and the dialectics of "direct contemplation"; 2) 16th-18th-century materialism largely associated with the metaphysical method of thinking, which was progressive at that time, and the dialectical ideas and conceptions contained in the philosophical doctrines of the day; 3) the versatile and

detailed development of dialectics in its own particular historical, idealist form—the dialectical method of German classical philosophy; 4) the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels. Besides these principal forms of philosophical thought, Marxist history of philosophy investigates transitional forms of philosophical theories and methods of cognition (e.g., the philosophical doctrines of the Renaissance, the anthropological variety of materialism in the modern period and the materialist philosophy of revolutionary democracy in the 19th century, associated with it, which contains such a “viable element” as dialectics that is regarded as the “algebra of revolution”, and so on).

Unlike a number of bourgeois historico-philosophical concepts which often approach philosophical ideas in the sphere of natural science as a “lower form of reasoning”, devoid of “universal merit”, and sometimes construct formalistic concepts of “philosophy of science”, artificially dividing science from world outlook, from the struggle between materialism and idealism in philosophy, Marxist works on the history of philosophy demonstrate that no genuine development of philosophy is possible without a philosophical grasp of the achievements of natural science and other sciences. Marxism-Leninism also demonstrates that without serious philosophical generalisation, without the utilisation and development of the philosophical method of thinking, no science could rise above empirical observation, thereby narrowing the horizon of human knowledge.

Thus, modern studies in the history of philosophy pursued by Marxists in the Soviet Union and some other countries* differ fundamentally from modern idealist concepts of the history of philosophy.

* See *History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-65; M. Yakovlev, *Marxism and Modern Bourgeois History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1964; L. Skvortsov, *Is Metaphysics Getting Its “Second Wind”?*, Moscow, 1966, *History of Philosophy: A Brief Outline*, Second ed., Moscow, 1969. (All in Russian.)

CHAPTER II

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY IN THE 19TH CENTURY. ITS TRADITIONS

1. DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM OF MARX AND ENGELS AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS PRECEDING IT

Dialectical and historical materialism, which came into being about 125 years ago, was a logical result of the previous progress of science and philosophical thought. At the same time, its formulation by Marx and Engels was a major revolution in philosophy.

Describing the appearance of Marxism as a new trend in the "materialist philosophy of the history of mankind" Plekhanov, one of the first historians of Marxism and Marxist philosophy, wrote: "Scientific socialism is not only the greatest but rather the only philosophical system of the *present* time worthy of the name. Its appearance marks a most significant turning-point in the history of human thought in general."* Substantiating this statement with respect to philosophy in his speech entitled "The Philosophical and Social Views of Karl Marx" Plekhanov said: "Marx's philosophy is the logical and inevitable consequence of Hegel's philosophy—that is what those discussing the question of the origins of modern socialism often tell us. That is true enough, but that is not all. Not by far. Marx succeeded Hegel as Jupiter succeeded Saturn—by toppling him from his throne. The emergence of Marx's materialist philosophy is a real revolution, the greatest revolution ever known in the history of human thought."** Comprehensive scientific analysis

* G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, in five volumes, Moscow, 1956-58 (in Russian).

** G. Plekhanov, *On Literature and Aesthetics*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1938 (in Russian).

of the essence of dialectical materialism, of its role in the history of philosophy and social thought, its approach to mankind's philosophical heritage was carried out in a number of works by Marx and Engels' great heir Lenin.

Lenin emphasised, above all, the continuous relationship existing between Marxist philosophy and the history of world science, philosophy and social thought and culture, demonstrating that dialectical materialism, which inherits the most valuable achievements in the philosophical culture of mankind and continues its finest traditions, provides correct and consistent scientific solutions to the fundamental problems with which human reason has had to contend.

The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels was fundamentally different from the materialism of the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries (for all the progressive character of the latter and the significant part it played in the development of science and the struggle against religion and idealism and in the ideological preparation of bourgeois revolutions). Marxism in philosophy amounts, in a way, to a denial or "sweeping aside" of the old materialism, since the latter was not dialectical but metaphysical, speculative, and did not extend to history because it did not apprehend the part played by revolutionary practice, was not yet linked to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and did not set itself the aim of radically changing the world. Lenin wrote: "Marx did not stop at eighteenth-century materialism: he developed philosophy to a higher level. He enriched it with the achievements of German classical philosophy, especially of Hegel's system, which in its turn had led to the materialism of Feuerbach. The main achievement was *dialectics*, i.e., the doctrine of development in its fullest, deepest and most comprehensive form, the doctrine of the relativity of the human knowledge that provides us with a reflection of eternally developing matter."² Lenin also pointed out that Marx's "*historical materialism* was a great achievement in scientific thinking. The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19 p. 24.

productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops. . . ."

At the same time, the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels amounted to a denial or "sweeping aside" of Hegelian or any other idealist dialectics, for Marxism set dialectics, which had been standing upside down, back on its feet, revealed the rational kernel that had been hidden beneath the mystical shell of pre-Marxist dialectics, integrated the dialectical principle of development with the new philosophical materialism, extending to the cognition of society and the individual and revealing the material sources of social and individual consciousness. Marx disclosed both the fundamental difference between his method of materialist dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics and the basic difference between the "rational dialectics" of the revolutionary proletarian outlook and the bourgeois outlook. He wrote: "My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenon form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought. . . . In its rational form it [dialectics—*Ed.*] is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary."**

The dialectical, contradictory unity of the denial of previous philosophy and preservation of the results of its development in Marxist philosophy was aptly expressed by

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 25.

** K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 20.

Engels in *Anti-Dühring*. Engels wrote: "Philosophy is therefore 'sublated' ... that is, 'both overcome and preserved'; overcome as regards its form, and preserved as regards its real content."^{*}

Marxist philosophy proceeds from the fact that a concrete science may become a theoretical science if it relies on the history of thought and its achievements. Speaking of natural science Engels observed: "Only by learning to assimilate the results of the development of philosophy during the past two and a half thousand years will it rid itself on the one hand of any natural philosophy standing apart from it, outside it and above it, and on the other hand also of its own limited method of thought, which was its inheritance from English empiricism."^{**} In this respect, too, the emergence and development of dialectical materialism marks the beginning of a new tradition in the history of philosophy. While in the past philosophical systems, which usually had pretensions to universality, regarded their propositions and concepts as the "ultimate truth" and often imposed them on concrete sciences concerned with nature and society, becoming "philosophy of nature" or abstract "philosophy of history", divorced from real life, in Marx's doctrine the relationship of philosophy to other sciences becomes altogether different. Dialectical materialism does not set itself up as the "science of sciences", to depute for other branches of scientific knowledge and foist upon them its propositions and conclusions. Dialectical materialism, which studies the more general laws of being and cognition, synthesises the achievements of sciences concerned with nature, society and reason and simultaneously enriches their development with its scientific-philosophical method. This enables other individual sciences to approach their subject dialectically, historically, in close association with the development of other branches of knowledge, including philosophy; they do not then confine themselves to a description and systematisation of experimental empirical data because they can attain philosophical comprehension of the process of cognition of relative truths, which bring science closer to the cognition of absolute truth.

^{*} F Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 166.

^{**} Ibid., p. 20.

The doctrine of Marx and Engels on the decisive and active role of man's social practice and the active aspect of thought was the central feature of dialectical and historical materialism, which inaugurated an entirely different philosophical tradition, as compared with earlier, pre-Marxist doctrines. Making a fundamental distinction between dialectical materialism and previous philosophical doctrines, from which Marxism inherits, while criticising and "sweeping aside" their historical narrowness, Engels wrote: "Natural science, like philosophy, has hitherto entirely neglected the influence of men's activity on their thought; both know only nature on the one hand and thought on the other. But it is precisely *the alteration of nature by men*, not solely nature as such, which is the most essential and immediate basis of human thought, and it is in the measure that man has learned to change nature that his intelligence has increased."*

Dialectical materialism is not merely a philosophical form of proletarian ideology; it is a scientific ideology, which is intimately associated with achievements in natural and social sciences and is in itself a specific, philosophical science. Marx and Engels, who, for the first time in history, evolved a new ideological orientation for philosophy which, in the last analysis, expresses the world outlook and interests of the revolutionary proletariat, could not merely follow one or another of their precursors. They had to—and they did—bring about a veritable revolution in philosophy and social science, after turning to the proletariat and demonstrating its historic mission—the destruction of capitalism and building of communism. However, this new, thoroughly revolutionary ideological orientation of philosophy and social thought in the interests of the proletariat and its practical revolutionary movement was able to succeed and win millions of supporters and followers over the last 125 years because it not only relies on previous achievements in philosophy and social thought but provides creative, scientific solutions to fresh philosophical problems associated with the revolutionary reconstruction of the world and epoch-making scientific discoveries.

Thus, for the first time in the history of philosophical and

* F Engels *Dialectics of Nature* Moscow, 1972, p 231.

social thought, with the emergence and growth of Marxism a new philosophical tradition takes shape, as the unity of ideology and philosophical science appears and strikes root in the revolutionary, socialist world outlook.

To claim that only those who belong to the working class and its party are able to perceive correctly the surrounding world, including the objective laws of nature and social development, would be to oversimplify and vulgarise Marxism to the extreme, not to mention the sheer fallacy of inferring from this erroneous premise that philosophers and other academics who belong to the propertied and educated classes are incapable of adequate philosophical perception of reality. The example of Marx, Engels, Lenin and some other Marxist philosophers who were not of proletariat extraction refutes these and similar superficial notions. To be a person of broad scientific views, to have a perfect mastery of the philosophical and other spiritual heritage of humanity, to scale the heights of scientific knowledge and world culture and thus grasp the basic processes of reality, discover its laws and be able to foresee the paths of social development and mankind's future destinies, an up-to-date education was essential. The formulation of truly scientific social and philosophical theory in the mid-19th century "is founded on the sum-total of human knowledges, presupposes a high level of scientific development, demands scientific work".* In the 19th century, however, the results, methods and technique of scientific work were not accessible—nor could they be—to the bulk of the working people, while they were accessible to educated representatives of the propertied classes, to people belonging to the intelligentsia in capitalist society.

Marx and Engels, who brought to light the great historic mission of the proletariat and consciously adopted its class position, evolved scientific socialism and appropriate philosophical and economic doctrines, linked them inseparably with the working-class movement and thereby gave socialist ideology a scientific foundation. They put an end to the former isolation of socialist thought and philosophical doctrines from revolutionary practice, and effected an overall revolu-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 163.

tionary change in social thought, which, as soon as Marxism had emerged, began to develop united in an organic whole with the revolutionary action of the proletariat and other progressive social forces supporting it. This new philosophical tradition which was born with the emergence of Marxism, dialectical and historical materialism, amounted to some extent to the "sweeping aside" of the narrowness of previous philosophical doctrines, most of which were divorced from the practice of revolutionary social forces, particularly from the working classes. The new philosophical tradition of Marxism was also a denial of the illusions typical of pre-Marxist ideologists, philosophers as well, that ideas themselves and the ideologists who set them forth shaped history at first hand. Marxism, for the first time in the history of philosophy and social thought, studied the cardinal causes of ideological—and also philosophical—development, viz., revolutionary popular movements, that give rise to great changes in history.

The dialectical unity of various aspects of social thought—philosophical, economic and socio-political—also becomes a new tradition in philosophy, which took shape with the emergence of Marxism. The materialist interpretation of history, which was evolved by Marx and Engels and is the continuation and logical consummation of the philosophical principles of dialectical materialism, consists first of all in the theory of historical materialism, which appears as the Marxist "philosophy of history" and general sociological theory of Marxism. Marx's interpretation of history also incorporates a dialectical-materialist explanation of the economic life of society and above all the historical development of production relations in society, i.e., a scientific theory of political economy. The materialist interpretation of history comprises further a scientific explanation of social and political relations in the life of society; it is in this capacity that the theory of scientific socialism (communism) is presented, closely associated with historical materialism, "abutting" on it, but which has a special subject of its own and, like political economy, is an independent science, a distinct component of the Marxist doctrine.

Whereas before 1847, in the early period of Marxism, the philosophical aspect, the formation and substantiation of

dialectical and historical materialism. had been pre-eminent, the revolutions that occurred in 1848-49 and their historical lessons made it necessary to elaborate and substantiate the socio-political theory of Marxism, which elucidated scientifically the problems of revolution, the class struggle and proletarian dictatorship. Marx and Engels devoted to these problems of scientific socialism a number of works written between the late 1840s (beginning with the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, written in 1848) and 1860. While the problems of the economic doctrine had already attracted the attention of the founders of Marxism in the forties and early fifties, from the late fifties and early sixties onwards they were central to Marx's research. It was to them that Marx devoted his classic work *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* and his immortal *Capital* in which he subjects to a comprehensive analysis the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism and substantiates, on a rigorously scientific basis of economic theory, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat which needs must result in the collapse of capitalism and its replacement by socialist society.

At the next stage of the historical development of Marxism, after the Paris Commune of 1871, along with the socio-political problems of the revolutionary workers' movement calling for the development of the theory of scientific socialism, the problems of Marxist philosophy again received priority. It was necessary to substantiate and elaborate dialectical materialism further and to substantiate, in the process of struggle against idealism and metaphysical thought, the materialist interpretation of history and philosophical problems of natural science. To these, as to other spheres of theoretical philosophical research, an outstanding contribution was made in those years by Engels, who carried on Marx's work after his celebrated friend's death in 1883.

As a result of the efforts of Marx and Engels, dialectical-materialist philosophy, the foundations of which they had laid as early as the 1840s, became in the latter half of the 19th century a fully comprehensive scientific system of philosophical knowledge linked inseparably with the dialectical method. The completion of the materialist edifice by Marx and Engels in their works in the field of history, economics and scientific socialism; philosophical synthesis of the achieve-

ments of natural and other sciences in the 19th century; elaboration of the system of laws and categories of the materialist dialectical method, started in the forties and continued during the fifties through to the eighties,—all these testified that the dialectical-materialist form of materialism, evolved by Marx and Engels as early as the 1840s, was coming more and more to resemble a system of ideas compatible with scientific thought. Dialectical materialism, Engels wrote, “is not the mere re-establishment of the old, but adds to the permanent foundations of this old materialism the whole thought-content of two thousand years of development of philosophy and natural science, as well as of the history of these two thousand years”.*

From the point of view of the founders of Marxism and their followers, if, during certain historical periods, the elaboration of one or another component of Marxism takes pride of place, that “does not mean that any of the aspects of Marxism may at any time be ignored; it only means that the *prevalence of interest* in one aspect or another does not depend on subjective wishes, but on the totality of historical conditions”.**

The indissoluble unity of philosophical theory and the dialectical-materialist method is also a new philosophical tradition which took shape in the course of the emergence and development of Marxist philosophy. In the pre-Marxist 17th- 18th- and early 19th-century philosophical doctrines the dialectical method was mostly to be found in idealist philosophical systems which—even at their culmination, Hegel’s philosophy—set a limit to the scope of dialectics, since in these systems it was applied chiefly to the realm of concepts, not to actual reality, to the past, not to the present and future, which meant that these systems came into conflict with the essentially progressive dialectical method. On the other hand, notwithstanding all the significant and viable “elements” of dialectics, contained in the doctrines of a number of pre-Marxist materialists (Spinoza, Diderot, Herzen, Chernyshevsky and others), pre-Marxist materialist systems were dominated by the metaphysical mode of thought

* F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 166.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 76.

which interpreted but narrowly development in nature, society and thought, did not appreciate that the essence and source of development lay in the unity and struggle of opposites, and failed to see the qualitative distinctiveness of each sphere of being and reason. This led to ever more fundamental clashes between the metaphysical mode of thought and the materialist outlook which necessarily required a consistent application of the principle of development to all material phenomena, and consequently to all spiritual phenomena ensuing from the former.

In the philosophy of Marx and Engels, for the first time in the history of human thought, method and theory were correlated in so far as the dialectical method which had developed in idealist systems was critically refashioned and replaced the metaphysical method of earlier materialism, becoming a dialectical-materialist method in the system of Marx's materialist philosophy. Materialist theory, which, thanks to the consistent application of the dialectical principle of development, had rid itself of mechanistic and naturalistic limitations, of speculative and certain fatalistic elements, after being extended to the interpretation of the history of society, became a consistent and integral dialectical-materialist theory. The theory of dialectical materialism, which is science-based and which is constantly developing and renewing its content, cannot in the least impede the application and development of the dialectical method in the philosophical system of Marxism. If correctly understood and consistently applied, the dialectical method does not lead to any departures from materialist theory in an idealist, relativist direction, and so on.

Marxism consistently pursues the dialectic principle in cognising the process of material reality and human thought and demonstrates the unity of objective and subjective dialectics. Engels wrote: "Dialectics, so-called *objective* dialectics, prevails throughout nature, and so-called subjective dialectics, dialectical thought, is only the reflection of the motion through opposites which asserts itself everywhere in nature. . . ."

Consistent commitment in philosophy, which insists on a

* F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, 1972, p. 211.

creative approach to theory, is an inalienable Marxist tradition, a new element not found in pre-Marxist doctrines. Many pre-Marxist doctrines defended the materialist line in philosophy and differed radically from idealist philosophical doctrines. Yet, few of them were capable of consistently defending the interests of progressive social forces, especially the working classes, and appreciating the need to link materialist philosophy as closely as possible with the interests and revolutionary struggle of those classes. Before Marxism, there had been no philosophical or social doctrine that could furnish the foundation of the world outlook of the revolutionary proletariat, the most consistently progressive class in history.

In unfolding the essence of the Marxist tradition of commitment in theory, in philosophy, Lenin observed time and again that Marx and Engels had been consistently committed in philosophy and always exposed all deviations of any kind from materialism in the direction of idealism. When describing the creative development of this tradition in the history of Marxism, Lenin noted: "The genius of Marx and Engels lies precisely in the fact that during a very long period, *nearly half a century*, they developed materialism, further advanced one fundamental trend in philosophy, did not rest content with repeating epistemological problems that had already been solved, but consistently applied—and showed *how* to apply—*this same* materialism in the sphere of the social sciences, mercilessly brushing aside as rubbish all nonsense, pretentious hotchpotch, the innumerable attempts to 'discover' a 'new' line in philosophy, to invent a 'new' trend and so forth."^{*}

Turning to the works of Engels Lenin points out that Engels, utterly in keeping with the spirit of Marx's ideas, "briefly and clearly contrasts the materialist and idealist lines in regard to *all* questions, . . . and right until 1894. . . . Engels continued to follow the latest developments both in philosophy and science, and continued with all his former resoluteness to hold to his lucid and firm position, brushing away the litter of new systems, big and little".^{**}

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 14, p 336.

** Ibid., p. 338.

At the same time, in order rigorously and consistently to continue the tradition of defending the committed materialist line in philosophy, launched by Marx and Engels, materialist philosophy had to be steadily advanced and creatively developed, as dialectics, the "life and soul" of Marxism, required. Marx and Engels always held that their theory—including their philosophical theory—was not a dogma but a guide to action. This immutable tradition of Marxism and its philosophy, which first took shape about a hundred and twenty-five years ago, runs through their entire history elevating it above both all that went before and modern non-Marxist trends in philosophy.

2. THE HISTORY OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY IN THE DISTORTING MIRROR OF BOURGEOIS AND REVISIONIST MARXOLOGY

The question of the historical path of the doctrine founded by Marx and Engels, of the traditions of their philosophy, was—and it is today—an object of intense ideological and political controversy.

There are some theoretical questions of the more pressing variety that are of significance for a correct understanding of the history of Marxism and its current development.

Firstly, there is the question as to whether Marxism is an integrated doctrine or whether there are in its development fundamentally different, divergent lines which are allegedly leading up to the "disintegration" of the Marxist doctrine and "deformation" of its philosophy, as bourgeois Marxologists—and not infrequently revisionists as well—like to assert.

Secondly, there is the question as to whether there is continuity in the development of Marxism at different stages of its history or, as bourgeois Marxologists claim, as to whether in the history of Marxism certain stages have given way to others of diametrically opposed content, thus splitting up Marxist theory into disparate parts.

Thirdly, there is the question as to whether Marxism, and its philosophy, is an international doctrine whose principles are universal and common to all countries or whether Marxist thought is divided on a "geographical" and "historical"

basis, developing in qualitatively different and even conflicting ways in different countries, so that it is divided into so-called Western and so-called Eastern Marxism.

The first of these questions is about different—or, as they are often called, divergent—trends in Marxism. Contemporary anti-communist Marxologists in the bourgeois world, such as the neo-Thomists Joseph Bocheński, Gustav Wetter, Thomas Blakeley, the American Marxologists Zbigniew Brzezinski, Alfred Meyer and pragmatist Sydney Hook, the West German “critic” of Marxism Iring Fetscher and the German-American philosopher Herbert Marcuse, who has pretensions to bringing Marxism “up-to-date”, the renegades Max Lange, Wolfgang Leonhard and others, have set forth an unsound hypothesis to the effect that Marxism is not an integrated whole, that it has never been monolithic. Some of them assert that there were and still are at least two divergent lines in Marxism.*

* Thus, Zbigniew Brzezinski, one of the “pillars” of US anti-communism, and Samuel Huntington in their book *Political Power: USA-USSR* describe the history of Marxism and its present state as a confrontation of two divergent lines, viz., of “ideological commitment” on the one hand and “scientism” and “political pragmatism” on the other. “Our age has been the age of ideology,” they write. “Ideological commitments have tended to dominate political behaviour. In the long run, however, this emphasis may fade . . . With achievement of a measure of industrial and technical know-how, strict dictatorial and ideological rule seems increasingly unnecessary. Abroad, the changes in Western Europe and the development of indigenous forms of socialism in the new states also threaten the black-and-white image of the world. Diversity in the communist world has also lessened the absolutist character of the ideology and made it increasingly relative.” (Z. Brzezinski and S. Huntington, *Political Power: USA-USSR*, N.Y., 1964, pp. 67-68.)

Brzezinski and Huntington are trying to replace the radical difference between socialist and bourgeois ideologies, which allegedly is giving way to their “convergence”, by a “conflict of opposites”, which supposedly is growing both in Marxism itself and in the relations between socialist countries. They keep on about the growing opposition between revolutionary ideals, which are allegedly receding further and further into the background, on the one hand, and “scientistic”, “technocratic” and “bureaucratic” concepts, which they maintain are taking root among Marxists, especially those in power, on the other. These assertions, which constitute a variety of the bourgeois falsification of the history of Marxism and its contemporary development, coincide with similar fabrications put forward by such Marxist renegades as the Yugoslav political writer Milovan Djilas and “Left” extremists, who slander Soviet society and its ideology.

Some bourgeois Marxologists claim that since the moment when Marx, after writing his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and *Theses on Feuerbach*, embarked on the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and subsequently *Capital*, two divergent lines in Marxism emerged, as was particularly evident from the works of Engels and Plekhanov and from some works by Lenin and his followers. One of these lines can allegedly be traced to Marx's early works, the other to Engels. This erroneous view, uncritically supported by some professedly Marxist theorists abroad, is expressed in the concept on the divergence of the "humanistic" and "scientistic" lines in the history of Marxism. From this standpoint, the "first line" is the line of "creative", "authentic", i.e., genuine Marxism, "universal humanism" or, as it is sometimes called, "naturalism-humanism", and so on. In this context Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and *Theses on Feuerbach*, in which the standpoint of practice is placed in the foreground, are regarded as the highest achievement of humanism and dialectics. However, this humanist line, the bourgeois Marxologists and revisionists argue, afterwards becomes less important and is ousted by the deterministic-dogmatic or so-called scientistic point of view, and a system of scientific conceptions and conclusions, which allegedly deviates from humanism and Marx's critical thought, subsequently takes precedence in the works of the founders of Marxism and their followers. The line of "anthropological humanism" or of "philosophy of practice", which was allegedly present only in Marx's early writings and is the only genuine and creative trend in Marxism, is according to the adherents of this viewpoint continued today only in the works of certain individual Marxists. A number of authors consider Georg Lukács (especially his *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* (*History and Class Consciousness*, 1923) and Antonio Gramsci to be the chief exponents of the "humanist line" in Marxism: the founder of the Italian Communist Party, Gramsci is falsely contrasted to Lenin, and his theory to Leninism.* Gramsci is declared to

* The unsoundness of contrasting Gramsci to Lenin and Leninism was demonstrated by Palmiro Togliatti in his work *Leninism and Gramsci*. (See A. Gramsci, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1959, in Russian.)

he the only theoretician among the leaders of the West European Communist Parties to have managed to link up communist doctrine with the traditions and particular features of his country. All this aims at belittling Leninism, the creative development of Marxism in the 20th century, and ignores the fact that the leaders and theoreticians of many Communist parties the world over have furnished excellent examples of creative development of Marxism in new historical conditions in their countries, taking into account their traditions and specific features. From the bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists' standpoint, the line of "humanist", "authentic" Marxism is continued also in the writings of "anthropological humanists" of the post-war period, in which category they place some Yugoslav philosophers connected with *Praxis*, some writers in other countries who consider themselves Marxists (e.g., Ernst Fischer, Roger Garaudy), as well as some philosophers who do not belong to the communist movement but write on the problems of man (Sartre, Fromm, Lefebvre, Marcuse, etc.).*

The core of the concept of "anthropological humanism", from its authors' point of view, is that the individual is the centre of the world and the sole source of all philosophy. In the "anthropocentrist" concept, man appears as a generic being from whom all his ontological forces are allegedly

* The uncritical attitude to a number of modern bourgeois philosophical trends, including bourgeois Marxological concepts, often leads some philosophers, who consider themselves Marxists, to overlook the fundamental difference between the socialist and bourgeois outlook and distort the actual history of Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy. For instance, Professor Predrag Vranicki in his report *Philosophy and the Modern Epoch*, delivered at a conference of the editors of philosophical and sociological journals published in socialist countries (Opatia, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, December, 1967), and Professor G. Petrović, speaking at a similar conference in November 1969, in Bucharest, viewed Marxism above all, as the critical theory of an individual and denied that it was a science of the objective laws of being and cognition, while they named as creative Marxists in philosophy the existentialist Sartre, the neo-Freudist Erich Fromm, the West German idealist philosopher Ernst Bloch, and some other philosophers who either have nothing to do with the communist movement and Marxism-Leninism and are combatting communism (e.g., Herbert Marcuse, L. Goldman) or have openly broken off with Marxism (Henri Lefebvre, Leszek Kolakowski, etc.).

alienated in any human society. The supporters of this concept see the meaning and purpose of philosophy to lie in the fact that philosophy is, above all, "critical thought" aimed at "unlimited negation", i.e., the negation of all modern conditions of man's existence, irrespective of the social system—socialist or capitalist—they relate to. That is how bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, and, after them, some misguided members of the working-class movement, represent the "first line" they have "discovered" in the history of Marxism and its philosophy.

As for dialectical materialism as the science of the general laws of development of nature, society and reason, as well as of the class struggle and socialist revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat, and so on, all these are supposedly subsequent "additions" to Marxism that have nothing to do with, and are even alien to, the humanist essence of Marx's doctrine.

The "second line" in the history of Marxism and its philosophy, in the opinion of the bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, is the so-called scientific line along which, according to them, Marxism began to develop in the late 1840s and gained ground in particular during the sixties and seventies.

Contrary to historical truth, the Marxologists attempt to present as "scientism" of a positivist variety, i.e., a specific empirical trend of thought, the exposition and interpretation of Marx's doctrine, philosophical theory and method found in Marx's *Capital* and Engels' *Anti-Dühring*, *Dialectics of Nature* and *Ludwig Feuerbach*, and in other works by the founders of Marxism which dwell on the cognitive, i.e., logical and methodological, as well as political, revolutionary functions of philosophy and theory as a whole.

This arbitrary and narrow interpretation of Marxism by bourgeois and revisionist critics often bears a resemblance to positivism, which, indeed, tends to take a scientific view of reality, reduce philosophy to the interpretation of complete data collected in specific branches of science, ignore the problems of man and his intellectual life, exclude them from philosophy, and so forth. The Marxologists falsely describe dialectical materialism from Engels to modern Marxism as a scientific-positivist variety of Marxism, while dia-

lectical materialism of the present day they call "scientistic dogmatic Marxism".

The bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists claim that this so-called scientistic-dogmatic line in Marxism is opposed to Marx's humanism as "critical thought of the epoch". They assert that the "besetting sin" of many Marxists, starting with Engels, is that the upholders of dialectical materialism give pride of place to the cognition of the most universal laws of nature and social being, that instead of regarding man as the "centre of the Universe" they allegedly embrace the so-called "cosmocentric" concept. In fact, however, the dialectical-materialist philosophy of Marx and Engels, which is closely associated with the scientific cognition of reality, with the dialectical-materialist comprehension of the objective laws governing the development of nature and society presupposes, rather than excludes, the active role of man and his practice in nature and society, in the process of changing them. Dialectical materialism then draws the logical deduction from the scientific cognition of these laws, rallying the working class and people to a fight for man's emancipation, happiness and all-round development. The humanist ideals of Marxism are indissolubly linked with the revolutionary critical method of dialectical materialism and the materialist interpretation of history.

Critics of Marxism-Leninism attack with particular fervour the Marxist-Leninist reflection theory. Defying historical evidence they allege that it is metaphysical, speculative, that it repeats the limitations of 18th-century French materialists. At the same time they try to draw a distinction between different periods of the philosophy of Marx and Engels, claiming that at certain periods the work of some of its ex-

* Modern "philosophical critics" of Leninism, e.g., Rudi Supek in *Praxis*, declare that Marxist thought in many countries—socialist as well—today follows the line of dogmatism, "technocratic scientism" and "bureaucratism", dubbing modern Marxist thought "Stalinism", "Stalinist positivism", "pragmatism", and so on. Here they have in mind not merely some erroneous views expressed in Stalin's works but the entire Leninism-based theoretical thought of the world communist movement from Lenin's death until the present. (R. Supek, "Još jednom o alternativni: staljinistički pozitivizam ili stvaralački marksizam?", *Praxis*, 1965, No. 6; R. Supek, "Der technokratische Szientismus und der sozialistische Humanismus", *Praxis*, 1967, No. 2.)

ponents (e.g., Marx in his "early" period, before 1845-46) was characterised by humanism alone, which, however, was devoid of scientific method and even system; as for Marx the author of *Capital* and particularly Engels and his works written in the 1870s, critics of Marxism-Leninism maintain that they no longer treated any humanist problems, and philosophical thought was losing its critical spirit by then, for at that time Marxist philosophy was taking shape as a system of dialectical materialism, a science of the objective laws of nature and history.

Such views on the history of Marxism and Marxist philosophy have no bearing on the truth, the real course of the history of social thought in the 19th century. If, as was mentioned earlier, at different periods of the history of Marxist doctrine, one or another of its components gained prominence, if a certain aspect of Marxist theory acquired primary significance and certain functions of Marxist philosophy (critical-revolutionary, humanist, logical-cognitive, methodological, etc.) were developed more than others, never in the history of Marxism did a situation arise where its founders shelved even temporarily one of the aspects of Marxist philosophy, whether the revolutionary-critical, dialectical-materialist method or scientific materialist epistemology, materialist interpretation of history, the humanist ideals, and so on. On the whole, the history of Marxism is characterised by unity and continuity of development. Never, at any stage of Marx's development, including the early period of the formation of Marxism (in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, *Theses on Feuerbach* and moreover in *The German Ideology*, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, etc.), was Marx an "abstract" humanist, supporter of anthropologism or naturalism, aloof from materialism, from scientific theory, from revolutionary ideology. Even then, at the first stage of the formation of Marxist theory, its founder elaborated the scientific dialectical method closely bound up with militant materialism and, while putting the finishing touches to the edifice of philosophical materialism, substantiated the materialist interpretation of history. Later, too, at the next stage of the history of Marxism, while he was elaborating political economy and the theory of scientific socialism on the theoretical foundation of dialectical and historical materialism, in

A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, *Capital* and other works, Marx was the theoretician of genuine socialist humanism. The difference is that during the second period of the history of Marxism the ideals of socialist humanism, which neither Marx nor Engels ever abandoned, already had a firm scientific foundation and were closely associated with the class struggle of the revolutionary proletariat, aimed at destroying capitalism and building a really humane society, a socialist society; these humanist ideals of Marx, like his teaching on socialist revolution and proletarian dictatorship, derive from his scientific, materialist interpretation of the objective laws of history. That is why the French Marxist Louis Althusser, the author of several books on Marx, is wrong in thinking that as soon as Marx had evolved his scientific system it became "theoretical anti-humanism" replacing the "hazy" and "vague" humanist ideals of Marx's "early" writings.

What can be said about Marx also applies to Engels. In his *Anti-Dühring*, *Dialectics of Nature*, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* and other works Engels expounded and formulated from the standpoint of consistent dialectical materialism the more general laws of motion and development of being and cognition thus furnishing a systematic philosophical substantiation of the theory of scientific socialism. On this scientific-methodological foundation, Engels, following in Marx's footsteps, worked out a programme for freeing man from the pressure of "external necessity" and first of all from social oppression rife under capitalism and proved that society needs must make a leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom, i.e., to communist society, in which all the potentialities of the individual will blossom forth and receive wide scope for development, and the individual will come into his own as a complete personality. Nor was there a single work by Lenin which was not permeated by the ideals of socialist humanism and which adopted any other but a revolutionary-critical approach to the problem of man, of the individual in society based on a scientific, materialist interpretation of history, and using Marx's dialectical method.

All this shows for a fact that in the history of Marxism and its philosophy, in the communist movement there have

not been two divergent, opposing "lines" of theoretical thought. That does not mean at the same time that the history of Marxism was a straight, smooth process, devoid of any contradictions and conflicts. In the course of its history, Marxism did not develop in a vacuum but in the context of intense class struggle, in particular ideological struggle. Revolutionary creative Marxism, whose classical representatives were Marx, Engels and Lenin, encountered—and continues to encounter today—inconsistently Marxist, semi-Marxist and altogether non-Marxist trends, whose advocates tried, and are trying still, to combine isolated, often vulgarised and garbled ideas and propositions, "smatterings" of Marxism popular among the working class and broad sections of the population, with some "elements" of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology.

On the one hand, the revolutionary doctrine of Marx and Engels, their scientific socialism and philosophy of dialectical materialism in the latter half of the 19th century in the labour movement, and later also in the social-democratic parties, were challenged by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois-reformist views of the opponents of revolution and supporters of conciliation with the bourgeoisie and its ideology (the followers of Proudhon in France, the Lassallians, Vollmar and later also Bernstein in Germany, and so on), who with respect to philosophy supported various bourgeois idealist systems. On the other, Marxism was opposed by petty-bourgeois anarchist and sectarian elements, "revolutionary phrasemongers" propagating "playing at revolution", preachers of "rebellion" of the Bakunin or Blanqui mould, who borrowed from philosophy subjective-idealist and voluntarist theories, according to which "*will*, not economic conditions, is the basis of . . . social revolution".* Throughout the history of Marxism two lines or rather two ideological-theoretical trends have been in conflict within the workers' and communist movement. Here, however, we are not concerned with the struggle of the so-called scientific and anthropological lines in Marxist philosophy and social thought. It was and is the struggle that creative Marxism, which organically combines a system of scientific knowledge and humanism,

* Marx. Engels. *Werke*. Bd. 18. S. 633-34.

logical grounding and a critical revolutionary character, loyalty to the principles of consistent militant materialism and the new method of materialist dialectics, has been waging against revisionist waverings from the Right and "Left", against reformism, "rotten-core liberalism" and petty-bourgeois-anarchist subjectivism and opportunism.

The second fundamental issue, closely associated with the first, is the question of continuity in the development of Marxism and the stages of its historical path. On this point, there are several versions which spring from bourgeois Marxologist concepts sometimes taken up by Marxist writers. Most typical in this respect are the "stage" classifications in Marxism, set forth by Gustav Wetter (*Dialectical Materialism. Its History and System in the Soviet Union*), Iring Fetscher (*From Marx to Soviet Ideology*), Herbert Marcuse (*Soviet Marxism*) and other critics of Marxism among bourgeois ideologists.*

What do "stages" in the history of Marxism constitute, from the Marxologists' point of view? And what periods actually did exist in the history of Marxism?

Basically the Marxologists see the history of Marxism and Marxist philosophy as a series of isolated and even remote "stages", each differing from, and not seldom opposing, the preceding one in content to the extent that no continuity in the development of ideas and conceptions in Marxism is possible or at least appears dubious. The "first stage" in the history of Marxism is, according to the Marxologists, the period of Marx's early writings which, to repeat, they often describe as a period of "abstract humanism", "naturalism-humanism", "anthropological humanism" or just "humanism". At that time, they allege, Marx was not a materialist at all but was striving to unite the dialectical tradition borrowed from Hegel with the humanist ideas of the Enlightenment; Marx, they maintain, concentrated his attention at that time on the problem of "alienation", the interpretation of which is supposedly the key to his entire philos-

* See G. Wetter, *Der dialektische Materialismus. Seine Geschichte und sein System in der Sowjetunion*, Freiburg, 1960; I. Fetscher, *Von Marx zur Sowjetideologie*, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bonn, 1959; H. Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism A Critical Analysis*, New York, 1961.

ophy. Many Marxologists hold that the "first stage" in Marxism continued till the mid-forties or even until 1848, i.e., until the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Then, they assert, after an interval, during which the revolutions of 1848-49 took place, the "second stage" began, when works on socio-political problems—*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* and *Capital*—were written and Marx evolved a scientific system of economic and socio-political views, often erroneously referred to as "economic materialism". The next stage, according to the Marxologists, embraces the works of Marx and Engels written in the seventies and early eighties, during and after the Paris Commune, when the founders of communism were allegedly wrong not only about the time when revolution could be expected to occur but also with respect to the inevitable revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*, etc.). At that time, they hold, Marx was remote from life and did not notice the changes that were taking place in society, while Engels schematised and dogmatised Marx's philosophy, retreating from dialectics to earlier eighteenth-century metaphysical materialism and ignoring the humanist preoccupations of original Marxism.

Bourgeois Marxologists occasionally fail to agree in their appraisals of the historical path of Marxism, nevertheless they all try to emasculate it by depriving it of its revolutionary and humanist content.*

* Thus Sidney Hook in his "What's Left of Karl Marx?" seeks to prove that Marx's forecasts about the inevitable collapse of capitalism were unsound. He writes: "...capitalism refused to die or even to collapse.... I haven't the time to discuss the reasons why Marx's predictions went wrong. But briefly it was his failure to allow for the influence of 'political economy'; the power of taxation... which was one of the demands listed in the 'Communist Manifesto'... the power of trade unions; and the power of scientific discovery itself." (S. Hook, "What's Left of Karl Marx?", *Saturday Review*, 1959, V. 42, No. 23, p. 13.) Simultaneously, Hook, in his efforts to upset Marx's doctrine and "prove" that it is inapplicable and impracticable in the modern epoch, mocks at other trends of bourgeois Marxology (springing from existentialism and "philosophical anthropology") that represent Marx as an "abstract humanist", who is above classes, parties and their struggle. He writes: "The intellectual historian of the future will be challenged by a strange phenomenon of the latter half of the 20th century—the second coming of Karl Marx. In the second coming, he

It is worth noting that some of the bourgeois Marxologists recently stopped categorically contrasting the "early" with the "mature" Marx and assert in their writings that Marx, unlike Engels, remained faithful in *Capital* and his other works of the 1860s-70s to the "anthropological" position without becoming either a dialectical materialist or historical determinist or champion of socialist revolution. Granted, there have also appeared of late in bourgeois Marxologist literature absurd assertions that besides the "early" and "mature" Marx there was yet a "third" Marx in the 1870s and early 1880s, when he allegedly lost contact with the working-class movement and, isolated from the "new" trends of theoretical thought, ceased to take any interest in the problems of society's development, the problem of man, etc.

The next "stage" in the history of Marxism, from the point of view of many bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, embraces the period between Marx's death (1883) and the October Revolution, which, contrary to historical truth, they single out as the period when Lenin's influence on Marxist thought began. They relate to this "stage" the works written by Engels in the eighties and early nineties. On the one hand, they ascribe to these works "more profound" scientism, naturalism, "economic materialism" and fatalism in their interpretation of society, while on the other, following in Bernstein's footsteps, they make out that at that time Engels reconsidered the historical-materialist outlook, parti-

appears not in the dusty frock-coat of the economist, as the author of *Capital*, nor as a revolutionary *sans-culotte*, the inspired pamphleteer of the 'Communist Manifesto'. He comes robed as a philosopher and moral prophet with glad tidings about human freedom valid beyond the narrow circles of class, party or faction." (S. Hook, "Marx's Second Coming", *Problems of Communism*, July-August, 1966, p. 27.)

Existentialist one-sidedness and preconceived judgements with relation to Marx's doctrine criticised by the pragmatist Sidney Hook are replaced by another, equally one-sided and preconceived approach, which also denies the scientific character and vital force of Marx's dialectical materialism. To wit, "...a doctrine which holds that all things are dialectically interrelated cannot be a logical guide to any scientific inquiry or experiment. . . Dialectical materialism cannot justify itself as a fruitful, heuristic method of scientific discovery". (S. Hook, *Political Power and Personal Freedom. Critical Studies in Democracy, Communism and Civil Rights*, New York, 1959, p. 162.)

cularly with respect to the interpretation of the role and place of superstructures, bringing to the fore the state and various forms of ideology and "liberating" them from the all-important influence of the economy. In this instance, the reformists, who withdraw the demand for a revolutionary destruction of the capitalist mode of production and preach instead gradual reform of the bourgeois state, culture, education system, etc., are fraudulently seeking to pass Engels off as their "ally"—Engels, who, contrary to the contentions of "economic materialists" and vulgarisers and in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism, emphasised the relative independence of politics and ideology and disclosed the active role of the latter in the revolutionary transformation of society. Classified by bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists as belonging to the same "stage" in the history of Marxism are Plekhanov, Lafargue, Mehring and other Marxist philosophers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to whom, on the one hand, they ascribe dogmatism, "scientism", and "economic materialism" allegedly borrowed from Engels, and whom, on the other hand, they regard as pioneers of a new, "rational" current in Marxist thought, who hoped more from democratic reforms than from socialist revolution. This "stage" is characterised by the spread of the so-called rational trend in the Marxist movement (Bernstein, K. Schmidt, subsequently Karl Kautsky, Kunow, Hilferding, O. Bauer, the Russian Mensheviks and other Second International theoreticians), whose members adhered to the materialist interpretation of history in some respects but reviewed (or rather revised) Marx's theory of socialist revolution, attacked Marx's revolutionary dialectics and replaced it by shallow reformist evolutionism, suggesting that the "rational elements" of Marxism should be combined with certain of the "latest" (i.e., bourgeois, anti-materialist and anti-dialectical) philosophical or sociological trends.

Our opponents acknowledge that this "rational" (i.e., revisionist) trend in the Social-Democratic movement came into conflict with the Leninist trend in the working-class movement, social thought and Marxist philosophy, especially after 1917. In fact, however, the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy and its history as a whole began not after 1917 but at the end of the nineteenth centu-

ry or, to be more precise, in the mid-nineties. Bourgeois and revisionist "critics" of Marxism-Leninism usually falsely describe the Leninist contribution to Marxism as subjectivism, voluntarism, Blanquism, etc., claiming that it is the opposite of humanism, Marx's materialist interpretation of history, social determinism, the Marxist doctrine as a whole, and so on.*.

Sometimes even some of the writers abroad who recognise Lenin's great role as a politician, revolutionary strategist, and leader of the communist movement still tend to separate his philosophical views from dialectical and historical materialism, describing his theoretical concept as "philosophical activism", "subjective materialism", etc. By the same token, these interpreters of Leninism try to break down the integral history of Marxism and its philosophy, to separate and isolate Leninism from Marxism; they try to make it seem as if Lenin's contribution concentrated wholly on the role of the subjective factor in history, taking no account of actual historical circumstances and so departing from Marx's "economic determinism". "Critics" of Leninism distort Lenin's methodology of the revolutionary initiative of the proletariat, which rests on a scientific materialist interpretation of the objective laws of history and proves on that very basis the growing part played by the subjective factor—the conscious activity of the working class and people. This is made out to be a departure from Marx's principles of humanism and a replacement of Marx's determinism by a "determinism of politics and force" (Raymond Aron). Following in Aron's footsteps bourgeois Marxologists such as Sidney Hook, Alfred Meyer, Gustav Wetter and others maintain, contrary to historical truth, that philosophy in Leninism is generally subordinated to political doctrine, which they

* So, for instance, the West German Marxologist H. Röhr in his *Pseudo-Religious Motifs in Marx's Early Works*, seeking to depict Leninism as the opposite of Marx's doctrine, maintains that Marx and Engels always avoided making forecasts about the socialist society of the future. They insisted on only one thing—that socialist society must be a classless society. Röhr observes further that it is wrong to refer so forcefully to Marx as the philosopher responsible for the theory of the proletarian dictatorship and the decisive role it was subsequently to play in Leninism. (H. Röhr, *Pseudoreligiöse Motive in den Frühschriften von Marx*, Tübingen, 1962, S. 59, 63.)

understand as the domination "of the minority over the majority", of party over class, etc.

Lastly, bourgeois falsifiers of the history of Marxism argue that Leninism, which according to their mistaken estimates was widespread for only a short time in the Soviet Union and abroad (for merely a few years immediately after the October Revolution?), gave way to another "dogmatic stage" in the history of the Marxist movement and social thought which they designate as "Stalinism". Some of our "critics" say that this period started in 1924, i.e., directly after Lenin's death, and according to others it began in the early thirties and lasted until the mid-fifties or right up until the present day. They disregard the fact that during the years of the personality cult which grew up in the USSR and some other socialist countries Lenin's ideas and policies, his philosophical-theoretical thought were nevertheless still followed, and Lenin's principles and ideas were developed and applied in practice by the Communist parties and Marxist scholars of various countries. "Critics" of Leninism refuse to take into consideration the enormous work carried out after the 20th Congress of the CPSU in the fifties and sixties by the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties to rid Marxist theoretical thought of extraneous features resulting from the cult of personality.** They often claim that "Stalinism" prevails to

* Thus, the West German renegade and Marxologist Wolfgang Leonhard in his part of the book *Soviet Ideology Today* (written in collaboration with Gustav Wetter), which contrasts Leninism with Marx's doctrine seeing the former as a conspiratorial programme and tactics, writes "Whereas with Marx and Engels the social-historical process was a matter of the revolutionary overthrow of one social system by another ... for Soviet ideology (the name Wetter and Leonhard give to Leninism—*M. I*) today it is a matter of the seizure of power by one party, which, in order to achieve this purpose, with the help of skilful tactics makes use of various social forces and strata." (*Sowjetideologie heute*, 2 W. Leonhard, *Die politischen Lehren*, Frankfurt am Main und Hamburg, 1963, S. 119)

It should be noted that some of the more reactionary Marxologists do not resort to such "camouflage" and openly—without any serious arguments, of course—ascribe dogmatism to communist doctrine as a whole, to Marxism-Leninism in general. Joseph Bocheński and Gerhart Niemeyer, for example, in their *Handbuch des Weltkommunismus* (*Handbook of World Communism*) vilify communism claiming that "it does not base itself on experience but is a dogma accepted a priori, on

this day in most Communist parties and socialist countries, which, according to their false conception, means that Communists today have veered from Marx's humanism towards "etatism", "technocratism", and "bureaucratism"; from Marxist dialectics to "dogmatism" and "conformism"; from a creative understanding of practice and cognition to the "speculation" and "metaphysics" of the old materialism with which they associate Lenin's reflection theory.

From the standpoint adopted by a number of "critics" of Leninism, today we are seeing the stage of a "new reading" of Marx or a "pluralist stage" of the history of Marxism, characterised by a so-called renewal of Marxist thought. Some of them say that this stage has been taking shape since the latter half of the forties and associate its onset with the renewed interest shown in Marx's early works after World War II, asserting that since then philosophical thought has begun to "revert" to Marx's early work. Others, however, assert that this "stage of renewal" began about 1954-56 and associate it with the fact that during the last fourteen to sixteen years there has emerged in the international communist movement a divergence of opinion concerning the interpretation of the principles of Marxism, the relation between the universal or international phenomena and specific, national ones. Some bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists maintain that so-called pluralism started striking root in the communist movement and in Marxist, including philosophical, thought in 1954-56, for national versions or variants of Marxism have been springing up. According to some ideologists (the recently deceased Pitirim Sorokin, for example), over the past few years Marxist views have been "integrating" with "Western" views, i.e., with bourgeois philosophical, sociological and economic views. Following the bourgeois Marxologists some writers speaking on behalf of Marxism maintain that at present Marxism is entering its "renaissance", (according to Predrag Vranicki, Milan Průcha and others) for the time has come when Marxism is beginning to

the strength of authority. It presents no logical ordered system but contains a series of crass contradictions. Lastly, it rejects and condemns every single criticism for it holds itself to be eternal and immutable". (J. Bocheński und G. Niemeyer, *Handbuch der Weltkommunismus*, Freiburg-München, 1958, p. 633)

incorporate "valuable elements of non-Marxist thought", and the philosophy of Marxism is coming to include in its philosophy propositions and concepts found in Husserl's phenomenology, in the writings of Sartre, Heidegger and other existentialists, in "philosophical anthropology", in Fromm's neo-Freudist concept of "psychoanalysis" and in other non-Marxist doctrines. With the help of these "valuable elements of non-Marxist thought" there allegedly emerge and develop quite naturally in Marxist thought different and even conflicting trends, without which, in the opinion of such interpreters of Marxism, Marxist theory cannot develop creatively in our times.

Modern "critics" of Leninism disregard historical fact, which shows that after World War II as well, and especially during recent decades, Marxist philosophy and social thought have been successfully and creatively developed by the Communist parties and international communist movement which, on its own initiative, is freeing itself from the influence of the personality cult, dogmatism and subjectivism. Bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists and some immature and weak people in some Communist parties, who fall under their influence, associate the current development of Marxist theory not with collective experience or the international unity of the theoretical studies made by the Marxist-Leninist parties, but with the instances of confusion and isolation of some contingents of the working-class movement, with revisionist efforts to "revitalise" Marxism with sundry "elements" of the bourgeois outlook.

Theories concerning the "stages" in the history of Marxism, put forward by bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, which deny the integrity and continuity of the history of Marxism-Leninism, run counter to authentic historical fact.

Facts show that throughout the history of Marxism, at every period and stage of its progress, the world communist movement preserved and enhanced the continuity of the key principles of Marxism. The different stages and periods of its history are characterised not by deviations from the main line pursued by the communist movement and its theoreticians but by the creative development of revolutionary Marxism in keeping with that line. The main line of the communist movement in the twentieth century is the progress of

Leninism. Leninism has provided the source on which the theoreticians and leaders of Communist parties drew in developing, now as before, Marxist thought in the Soviet Union and elsewhere with respect to the changing historical situation and conditions in their countries. That is why any division of the history of Marxism and its philosophy in the current epoch into "Leninist" and "post-Leninist" stages is absolutely groundless. The vast majority of Communist parties have been loyal to the principles of Leninism, to its revolutionary traditions and its philosophical theory and method for almost fifty years since Lenin's death and continue to remain loyal to them. Leninism as a new stage in the development of Marxism comprises the entire current epoch, not merely the period prior to 1924.

The third important issue, which has been discussed in works on the history of Marxism for a long time now, is whether Marxism—and dialectical materialism—is an international doctrine or whether it is of a "local", limited character, pertaining merely to a group of countries and having no relevance to others. It is also a much-debated question as to whether Marxism, and its philosophy, has always represented an international phenomenon or whether it has been split into different trends—"variants", "forms", etc.—on a geographical, national or some other kind of basis, and cannot at present any longer be regarded as an international doctrine.

Marxism was considered for a long time to be a purely "Western" doctrine and it was held that, having emerged as a result of the development of large-scale industry and the proletariat in Western Europe, Marxism was associated above all with the "rationalist" trends of West European philosophy and social thought and was not applicable to other countries in which industry was not highly developed, the proletariat did not constitute a major part of the population, no labour and revolutionary movements with strong and enduring traditions existed, and so on. This led some idealist philosophers and even democratic thinkers in Russia (the Narodniks, for example), other East European countries, Asian countries, etc., erroneously to conclude that Marxism and its philosophy could not be applied outside the confines of Western Europe. A different conviction began to take

shape both in the West and East in the current epoch, after the victorious October Revolution of 1917 in Russia, and later on after revolutionary changes had been effected under the banner of Marxism in some other East European countries and some Asian countries. Alarmed at the prospect of the growing influence of Marxism, West European and US bourgeois ideologists began to proclaim Marxism an "illegitimate" product of European thought, a doctrine which was allegedly alien to "Western civilisation" and unacceptable to Western peoples with their substantial tradition of bourgeois-democratic development, and to present Marxism as an ideology breaking with that tradition. On the other hand, some bourgeois-nationalist ideologists in the East declared that Marxism-Leninism with its materialist doctrine was alien to the Oriental "soul", psychological make-up, etc., that it rejected the religious, methodological and speculative-ethical traditions, allegedly intrinsic to Eastern culture and not to be replaced in the spiritual life of the Eastern peoples by Marxist ideas and views.

Bourgeois ideologists have long asserted that there is no ideologically integrated Marxist doctrine and they allege that the diversity of social conditions and schools of scientific thought makes the existence of a universal scientific and social theory and a general philosophic method impossible. The pluralist point of view, i.e., the so-called plural, poly-variant approach with regard to social and scientific problems, gains wide currency in bourgeois scientific literature. In accordance with the "principle of pluralism", of which Raymond Aron is a prominent exponent, no philosophical or social theory can explain the social-historical process as a whole; no method of thinking can be applied to all spheres of knowledge and activity. "Critics" of Marxism-Leninism among the bourgeois Marxologists set either chronological or territorial limits to the scope of influence exerted by Marxism-Leninism, casting doubt on the international significance of Marxism-Leninism today. Some Marxists, too, have come to share the erroneous view that in our age there can be no single international Marxist doctrine, and that there exists "Western Marxism" on the one hand, and different trends of "Eastern Marxism", including "Soviet Marxism", on the other.

Critics of communism would confine Marxism-Leninism and its development in the current epoch to the application of Marxist theory in conditions of backward agrarian and industrially underdeveloped countries and also to the use of coercive methods of proletarian dictatorship, to which Marxism-Leninism never attached prime importance in relation to the socialist statehood of the proletariat. As for notorious "Western Marxism", the bourgeois and revisionist ideologists seek to invest it with such properties as fit bourgeois or petty-bourgeois ideological trends, viz., with a liberal interpretation of the relations between different classes and appeals for a blunting of class contradictions and moderation of the class struggle, opportunist tolerance of bourgeois ideology, reformist glossing over the difference between socialist and bourgeois-democratic reforms, endeavours to "integrate" the spiritual values of socialism and capitalism, of the socialist and bourgeois world outlook, of materialism and idealism, etc.

Critics of Marxism-Leninism consider with regard to the current epoch that the revolutionary, materialist and dialectical traditions of the nineteenth-century Marxism have shifted to the East, to Russia and other countries, while "Western Marxism" is allegedly breaking with these traditions. With this, they ignore the indisputable fact that Marxists in West European countries, especially the leaders and theoreticians of the Communist parties formed in these countries after October 1917, such as, for instance, Maurice Thorez, Marcel Cachin, Waldek Rochet, Jacques Duclos in France, Antonio Gramsci, Palmiro Togliatti, Luigi Longo in Italy, Franz Mehring, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Klara Zetkin, Ernst Thälmann, Wilhelm Pieck, Walter Ulbricht, Max Reimann in Germany, William Gallacher, Harry Pollitt, Palme Dutt in Great Britain, William Foster and Gus Hall in the United States and many other revolutionary Marxists do not dissociate themselves from the international Marxist doctrine. They proceed from its revolutionary principles, defend and apply them taking into consideration the historical situation and conditions in their countries, adhere to the philosophy of dialectical materialism, and oppose those "Western" philosophical and socio-political doctrines which are alien to Marxism-Leninism.

The history of Marxism and its philosophy offers instructive lessons. It shows, as Lenin observed, that each time the enemies of Marxism "annihilated" it, it gained a still more deeper and more powerful hold over workers' minds, becoming "stronger, more hardened and more vigorous".

Over the 125 years of its existence, Marxist philosophical and social thought has gripped the minds of hundreds of millions of people. The international communist movement, which consistently champions and creatively develops Marxist philosophical and social thought, is fighting to make Marxism-Leninism the world outlook, conscious conviction and guide to action for people throughout the world

3. HISTORICAL PATH OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF MARX AND ENGELS AND ITS TRADITIONS (ON THE GENESIS, SUBJECT-MATTER AND STRUCTURE OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY)

We briefly dwelt above on the interpretations of the history of the formation and development of Marxist philosophy, put forward by contemporary bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists. Analysis of these interpretations shows that even when bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists recognise the power, vitality and appeal of Marx's doctrine and profess their "objective" and "favourable" attitude to his philosophy, class prejudice renders them incapable of comprehending its scientific and creative character, the consistent completeness of the Marxist philosophical doctrine and the continuity of its traditions. The Marxist-Leninists alone, who closely associate philosophical thought with the revolutionary working-class and communist movement, uniting in a single whole scientific research and the practice of revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism, have been able to "build a bridge" between the history of Marxism and its philosophy in the nineteenth century and the modern problems of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and provide in their works an integral scientific interpretation of the historical process of development of Marxist philosophy, its key problems and their solutions.

· V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 31.

The more important among the problems of the history of Marxist philosophy which are the subject of the intense theoretical struggle Marxism has to wage against the various forms of its "reflection" in bourgeois and revisionist literature are those of the genesis of Marx's philosophy; the historical development of the subject-matter, structure and functions of Marxist philosophy; the division into periods and the objective laws of the history of Marxist philosophy; the continuity of its development. Let us now briefly consider these problems.

The Problem of the Genesis of Marxist Philosophy

In the past, too, some prominent Marxist students of the history of Marxism (G. Plekhanov, Franz Mehring, Antonio Labriola and others) and Soviet historians of Marxism and its philosophy (V. V. Adoratsky, L. I. Axelrod-Ortodox, G. F. Aleksandrov, A. M. Deborin, M. V. Serebryakov, etc.) recognised that the appearance of Marxism had been tantamount to a revolution in philosophy, and provided general indications of the qualitative difference between dialectical and historical materialism on the one hand, and the philosophy that preceded it on the other. At the same time they disclosed, above all, continuity in the history of philosophy, regarding Marxism mainly as a result of the previous achievements of science, philosophy and social thought.

Sometimes in treating of the genesis of Marxist philosophy A. M. Deborin, L. I. Axelrod-Ortodox and some other Soviet historians of philosophy erroneously approximated dialectical materialism and pre-Marxist philosophy, failing to emphasise the fundamental difference between Marx's materialist dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics and setting forth a one-sided, and therefore erroneous, theory that Marx's philosophy was a synthesis of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism.* This version of the genesis of

* In the 1920s-40s this erroneous version was based, among other things, on the copy of Plekhanov's lecture on the *Philosophical Evolution of Marx* which was wrongly ascribed to Plekhanov himself and was published by L. I. Axelrod-Ortodox and later included by D. B. Ryazanov in Plekhanov's *Collected Works*. It was inferred from this copy that Plekhanov viewed the dialectical materialism of Marx and

Marxism failed to pay due consideration to the key socio-historical conditions of society's development and the class struggle of the proletariat which explained the appearance in the middle of the 19th century of the philosophical doctrine of Marx and Engels, which was qualitatively new in its class content and theoretical essence and expressed the basic interests and views of the revolutionary proletariat. This erroneous hypothesis failed to take account of the sum total of the philosophical, economic and socio-political doctrines from which Marxism and its philosophy took their source, and was not equipped to explain the complicated and self-contradictory evolution of dialectical and historical materialism which was not only a result of the previous development of philosophy and social thought but was, in a sense, its negation, a "sweeping aside" of many of its aspects and tenets.

During discussions of the 3rd volume of the *History of Philosophy*, published in 1943, which were held in 1944, and in the course of the philosophical debate of 1947, held in connection with Academician G. F. Aleksandrov's *A History of West European Philosophy*, A. A. Zhdanov and some other Soviet philosophers subjected to criticism errors springing from a certain approximation of Marxist philosophy to the philosophical doctrines of its precursors, especially to Hegel's idealist dialectics. At the same time, both during the discussions and in some works by Soviet philosophers,

Engels as a synthesis of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism and believed that the entire path traversed by Marx and Engels consisted of three stages: 1) "abstract Hegelian self-awareness" (until the forties); 2) "Feuerbach's concrete-abstract man" (the forties); 3) dialectical materialism, whose object of study is "the real man existing in a real class society in a definite socio-economic environment" (since the forties). (G. Plekhanov, *Selected Works*, Vol 18, p. 333, in Russian) We have established that this copy was not written by Plekhanov and for the most part does not correspond to the views on Marx's philosophical evolution stated in Plekhanov's published works (See M. Iovchuk, *Plekhanov and His Works on the History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1969, pp. 156-74, in Russian.) With regard to Marx's philosophical evolution Plekhanov, as well as other eminent Marxist philosophers who carried out research into its history, did not share in the slightest degree the erroneous view of "filiation of ideas" or reduce the essence of the revolution wrought by Marx and Engels in philosophy to a purely logical synthesis of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism.

published afterwards (1947-53), disproportionate emphasis was laid on the revolutionary negation by Marxism of all previous philosophy while due significance was not attached to continuity in the development of philosophy, past philosophical traditions were not subjected to all-round analysis, and some trends which preceded Marxism (classical German philosophy, critical utopian socialism, etc.) were often treated in purely negative terms. In Marxist literature on the history of philosophy both in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, particular attention has been paid over the past fifteen to twenty years to the study of the revolutionary change in philosophy effected by Marx and Engels in the 1840s, to the genesis of the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism. A number of works published in the fifties and sixties subjected to criticism the erroneous conceptions of Marx's philosophical evolution entertained by bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, in which, for instance, they reduced the genesis of Marxism to a continuation of Hegel's dialectics or pre-Marxist materialism. These works demonstrate the unsoundness of the "two Marxes" theory, according to which, at the end of the 1840s Marx allegedly broke off with earlier philosophical tradition and departed from the humanist position he had held in 1844-45 in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and in the *Theses on Feuerbach*.

Controversy on the genesis of Marxist philosophy has not subsided to this day. The erroneous theory that Marx the philosopher derives his ideas not so much from the emancipation movements and science of his day or from the materialism and dialectics of previous thinkers as from bourgeois-democratic "anthropological" humanism, and that his early work, the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, is the summit of Marx's philosophical thought has penetrated into Marxist literature and gained currency in some countries. Charting the genesis of Marxist philosophy from Marx's interpretation in the *Manuscripts* of the category of alienation which many philosophers outside the Soviet Union often regard as the eternal and cardinal category of social life, social thought and philosophy, some authors mistakenly believe that during the first period of his theoretical studies Marx adhered to the principles of abstract humanism, "naturalism-humanism" (which they see as the essence of Marx's

philosophy), and not to those of dialectical materialism. Subsequently, however, according to bourgeois Marxologists and some philosophers who call themselves Marxists but who adopt an erroneous position, Marx withdrew from his humanism to the standpoint of "so-called dialectical materialism". A number of works by bourgeois and revisionist interpreters of Marx's philosophy, which deny that after 1843-44

For instance, the Catholic philosopher Gustav Wetter in his *Die Umkehrung Hegels* claims that neither humanist ideas nor the dialectics which Marx "borrowed" from Hegel are compatible with materialism. Taking advantage of the imperfect, inaccurate formula found in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* to the effect that "consistent naturalism or humanism distinguished itself both from idealism and materialism, constituting at the same time the unifying truth of both" (K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, 1959, p. 156), Wetter ascribes to Marx the standpoint of philosophical idealism: "if the inner essence of nature is always perceived as a human essence, it means that man must have always been present in nature in a timeless, i.e., ideal manner, as a kind of entelechy or in some other way, even when historical man did not yet exist and there was not yet any history apart from natural history. With the assumption of man's timeless pre-existence of that kind one leaves the realm of philosophical materialism" (G. Wetter, *Die Umkehrung Hegels. Grundzüge und Ursprünge der Sowjetphilosophie*, Köln, 1963, S. 27.) As for dialectical materialism, the introduction of this concept and content peculiar to it "must be attributed to Engels" (*Ibid.*, S. 12).

In her work, "A Contribution of the Criticism of Some Bourgeois Interpretations of the Genesis of Marxist Philosophy", published in the book *Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today*, G. L. Belkina, who analyses *Gründe des dialektischen Materialismus im europäischen Denken* (*Foundations of Dialectical Materialism in European Thought*) by Hans Köhler, a West German theologian, quotes some highly revealing statements by Köhler, who looks for the roots of Marx's philosophy in the "mass ideologies" of the Middle Ages, of the period between the Reformation and Renaissance, for it was there, in the Christian doctrines, that "for the last time in Western history, a truly broad vision of the world and human existence was provided" (H. Köhler, *Gründe des dialektischen Materialismus im europäischen Denken*, München, 1961, p. 11). Both Gustav Wetter's position and Köhler's "discovery", as Belkina points out, spring from the idea that Marxist philosophy, allegedly based on "faith in science", seeks to replace the religious doctrine concerning man's relationship with nature by a sort of "religious surrogate", a new, communist "eschatology". However, these attempts at turning Marxism into a kind of religion or eschatology, as Belkina indicates quite correctly, are unsound for it is hard (perhaps even impossible) "to find, without prejudice and 'contriving', any similarity between such essentially different things as the scientific world outlook, which rests on the analysis of facts and historical developments and

it was of a dialectical materialist character, reject the indisputable fact that in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, for all the terminological imperfections and immaturity of some propositions, Marx's humanism had already acquired a class, communist character and was philosophically substantiated from the standpoint of emergent dialectical materialism (although the concept was not referred to as such in the *Manuscripts*, just as it was not used in other early works by Marx).

The Marxologist assumption that "naturalism-humanism" is Marx's "authentic" philosophy has become widespread among some philosophers in socialist countries due in part to the fact that Marxist philosophical literature for a long time failed to pay proper attention to the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (which, incidentally, were not included in the *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*). At one time it was not pointed out in Marxist literature that after 1844 as well Marx continued to develop humanist ideals in his works and to elaborate the problem of man, including the problem of alienation. Literature on the history of philosophy, too, often failed to attach due importance to the history of the Marxist-Leninist view of the role played by the "anthropological element", particularly its biopsychic aspect, in man's life. The question of "man's ontological forces", the alienation of which was discussed in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* was sometimes reduced merely to a question of the "historically transitory conditions of material production", and so forth. Recently there appeared philosophical works by some Soviet (T. I. Oizerman, M. I. Petrosyan, B. G. Ananyev, L. I. Buyeva, S. M. Kovalyov, A. G. Myslivchenko, G. A. Smirnov and others) and foreign writers (S. Angelov, C. I. Gulian and others), which prove that the problem of man is not in the least alien to dialectical materialism, that precisely Marxism-Leninism elaborates this problem and solves it on a scientific basis. These works show that not only in Marx's works written in 1844-47 but in his later works, especially in *Capital*, as well

which has proved its authenticity in practice, and religious faith, i.e., that which does not pay the slightest attention to facts or actual processes, scientific analysis or practice" (Marx's "*Capital*" and *Philosophy Today* Moscow, 1968, pp. 76-77, in Russian).

as in works by Engels, the ideals of communist humanism, the problem of man, of his emancipation and all-round development are closely interrelated with materialist dialectics and historical materialism which base themselves on the earlier humanist tradition and develop genuine, socialist humanism on a new, proletarian and class foundation.

The content of the works of Marx and Engels, from their early period onwards (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, *From the Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right*, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, *The German Ideology*, *The Holy Family*, etc.), shows that Marx's "philosophy of practice", the Marxist doctrine on the communist transformation of the world goes back not only to the traditions of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century materialism and critical utopian socialism but also to some other progressive trends of philosophical and socio-political thought (the humanist ideas of eighteenth-century German and French Enlighteners, the dialectical concept of German classical philosophy, for instance, Fichte's proposition on the active role of the subject, etc.). Yet, even in the works of some Marxists the genesis of Marxist philosophy is presented in such a way as to suggest that Marx and Engels regarded dialectics mainly as a specific method of logical thinking, passing over the question of the role of dialectics in solving the "anthropological" aspect of philosophy (the problem of man, treated in the process of development, complete with all its contradictions, in its relationship with changes in nature in the course of purposeful activity, and so on). The fact that this problem is elaborated in insufficient detail in Marxist philosophical literature is turned to account by bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, who see in the works of Marx and Engels written after 1844 a sort of "withdrawal" from humanism to scientism.

It would be wrong to reduce the essence and versatile functions of Marxist philosophy merely to the criticism and negation of all existence on the basis of a study of its genesis, as do some revisionist interpreters of Marxism, and hold that the revolutionary-critical philosophy of Marxism is essentially incapable of employing the scientific method since scientific knowledge is allegedly special, parcelled, and also "conformist" in so far as it adapts itself to the reality of

the surrounding world.' On the other hand, some revisionist interpreters of Marxism, Ernst Fischer, for example, in describing the genesis of Marxist philosophy as a simple "filiation of ideas" not connected with the practice of the liberation movement, seek to isolate Marxist philosophy from ideology, depriving Marx's philosophy of its militant ideological and political function.

Even before it was enriched by profound scientific analysis of the European revolutions of 1848-49, by the brilliant scientific investigation of economic and social relations in Marx's *Capital*, and by Engels' analysis of 19th-century natural science, Marx's scientific philosophical theory, which took shape as early as 1844-48, had constituted a major triumph of philosophical science. The theory of Marxism and its dialectical method are critical and revolutionary in the highest degree thanks above all to the fact that Marxism is a science that probes deep into the objective laws of the life of society and apprehends the laws and tendencies pertaining to its development. "And this latter quality is indeed completely and unconditionally inherent in *Marxism*, for this theory directly sets itself the task of *disclosing* all the forms of antagonism and exploitation in modern society, tracing their evolution, demonstrating their transitory character, the inevitability of their transformation into a different form, *and thus serving the proletariat as a means of ending all exploitation as quickly and easily as possible.*"**

Both in the period of the formation of the scientific and revolutionary outlook of Marx and Engels, which was crowned by the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, and during subsequent periods of the history of Marxism, there steadily developed a consistent tradition—the indissoluble unity of Marxism's scientifically-founded content, revolutionary activity and initiative, the creative effectiveness of its theory and its unbreakable ties with the movement of the working classes. This remarkable new tradition of Marxism

* A statement of that kind was made, for instance, in Prof. Vranicki's paper, *Philosophy in the Current Epoch*, delivered at the town of Opatia (Yugoslavia) at a conference of editors of philosophical and sociological journals published in socialist countries, which was held on December 14-16, 1967.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 327.

was vividly described by Lenin, who wrote: "Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations, and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class."¹

The Subject-Matter and Structure of Marxist Philosophy

Some interpreters of Marxist philosophy exercise a deliberately narrow and one-sided approach to the subject of Marxist philosophy. Some of them reduce Marxist philosophy to an ideological "doctrine" which, they maintain, is not a system of philosophical knowledge, has no scientific foundation, amounts to a rift with all science and philosophy that went before, and not infrequently appears even as a kind of religious doctrine, as "communist eschatology". Others, who approximate Marxist philosophy to positivism, maintain that its subject-matter is not independent but amounts to one interpretation or another of specific scientific data on nature and society, being a means of their logical definition (in philosophical language). A further group (whose activity and influence have grown lately), would like to take advantage of the increased prestige of Marxist philosophy, try to link it up with idealist concepts of the "philosophy of life" (especially with existentialism and "philosophical anthropology"), and in accordance with their approach present the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy as a critical negation of all reality from the standpoint of the interests of the individual (of man "at large").

Thus, by selecting from the universal relationship one or another of its aspects and interpreting it in a one-sided way, modern interpreters of Marxism in effect misrepresent Marxist philosophy, presenting it in a biased, and often grotesque light.

¹ Ibid., Vol. 13, p. 36

However, the critical-revolutionary function of Marxist philosophy, which has always had dialectics, the most all-round and detailed theory of development, at its core, was actually associated as early as 1844-48, especially in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, with the key interests and practical revolutionary struggle of the emergent class of the proletariat and its historic mission to overthrow capitalism and build a new, socialist society. Marx wrote, "Nothing hinders us, therefore, from associating our criticism with the criticism of politics, with the Party stand in politics, and therefore identifying it with *actual* struggle."*

During its early years, however, Marxist philosophy had not yet produced a system of knowledge such as to make it a full-fledged science of the universal laws of development of nature, society and thought. Profound study and synthesis of the experience of the class struggle, particularly of the 1848-49 revolutions in Europe, by Marx and Engels, the all-round examination of the capitalist formation in *Capital*, and the economic and socio-political works of the founders of Marxism published in the 1850s and 1860s, furnished an example of creative development of dialectics closely bound up with consistent materialism. Supported by the sum total of these economic, historical and sociological studies, dialectics emerged at that time as a genuine science of the most universal laws governing the development of nature, society and thought, as the dialectical method of cognition of reality and of logical thinking. Lenin observed that in *Capital* Marx had applied to a single science (i.e., to political economy) "logic, dialectics and the theory of knowledge of materialism".** Marx wrote in the Foreword to the second edition of the first volume of *Capital* that this dialectics "includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence".**

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 1, S. 345.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 319.

*** K Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, p. 20.

Subsequently, in the 1870s-80s, Marx and Engels developed dialectics as a science, enriching the subject-matter of their philosophy. Engels, who investigated in his works *Anti-Dühring*, *Dialectics of Nature*, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, *Ludwig Feuerbach* ... etc. not only the laws of social development but also the laws of development of nature, the laws and forms of logical thinking and the development of philosophical thought, gives us a science-based systematic picture of the overall correlations and most universal laws of all development. Thus Marx and Engels defined in more precise terms and substantiated the subject-matter and structure of Marxist philosophy singling out not only its ideological and revolutionary-critical, but also its theoretical-cognitive, logical and methodological aspects.

One can say that the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy as a system of the philosophical knowledge, ideas and concepts of dialectical materialism had taken final shape by the 1870s.

In summing up the results of the emergence and development of Marxist philosophy, which, from the very start, has been consistent materialism hand in hand with dialectics and extended to the cognition of society, Engels described it as dialectical and historical materialism. Engels firmly rejected the idea of philosophy as the "science of sciences". In his works, he conveyed the idea that cognition of diverse natural and social laws was part of "positive" (special) sciences of nature and history while the theory of thought—formal logic and dialectics—was an independent doctrine that had come down from the philosophy of the past. This, however, does not mean at all that, according to Engels, philosophy is not a science of the laws of the objective world, i.e., of nature and social history. It merely means that philosophy reveals in laws and forms of thought the reflection of such of the more general laws of the objective world—nature and society—and cognition as are disclosed through the agency of the special sciences of nature, society and thought and are the subject of scientific philosophy, i.e., dialectical and historical materialism.

The definition of Marxist philosophy as dialectical materialism, in which Marx's philosophical theory and method,

dating from 1843-44, are integrated, was introduced by Engels in *Anti-Dühring* in 1877-78. This definition of the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy as "the science of the general laws of motion and development of nature, human society and thought"* is not Engels' "own" invention, as some bourgeois and revisionist writers claim. This definition, which logically follows from the essence of Marx's philosophy and from all his works written after 1843, including the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, has stood the test of time and has not become obsolete in the least.

Any serious philosophical doctrine of the past had to solve, in one way or another, the problem of man and his relation to the world, the essence of man ("generic", social, psychological, etc.), of man's place in nature and society, the purpose of his life, his spiritual and ethical experience, and so on. These functions of philosophy are adequately embodied in Marxism. Ever since they emerged, dialectical and historical materialism have been providing their own solutions to the problems of man, solutions which differ essentially from the views of earlier thinkers. Marxism regards these problems in intimate association with the history of social development and changes in the social conditions of man's existence and demonstrates that "the real intellectual wealth of the individual depends entirely on the wealth of his real connections".** While Marxism on the whole explains the relation of man and his practical activity to the external world, the philosophy of Marxism, which also deals with this problem, has a particular function of its own. It defines the relation of thought to being, thereby solving the cardinal question of philosophy in a concrete, historical way. Dialectical materialism shows how in the process of their practical activities carried on in the modern historical situation people (a social group, a social class, society) apprehend being, the objective world and its laws, with the purpose of transforming it. Thus, dialectical materialism, in the long run, substantiates philosophically the revolutionary reorganising activities of the working class and the masses who are effecting the communist transformation of the world.

* F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 169.

** K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 49.

The Subject-Matter and Structure of the History of Marxist Philosophy

The subject-matter of the history of Marxist philosophy changes and develops alongside the changes in the subject-matter and structure of Marxist philosophy. Recent Marxist works on the history of philosophy usually describe the subject-matter of the history of Marxist philosophy as the history of the emergence and development of the principles, ideas and concepts of dialectical and historical materialism, at the centre of which is the history of the emergence and elaboration of materialist dialectics as a method of scientific-philosophical cognition and transformation of the world. The history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy includes in its subject-matter the formation and development of dialectical-materialist views on the problem of man, above all, on the question of man's relation to the world in the context of socio-historical practice. Lenin graphically expressed this idea in the *Philosophical Notebooks* when, making an abstract of Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik*, (*Science of Logic*) he drew the conclusion that "the world does not satisfy man, and man decides to change it by his activity".*

In dealing with the question of the subject-matter of the history of Marxist philosophy and of its traditions we must not overlook the fact that in the past there appeared in Marxist literature controversial and even mistaken conceptions of the historical development of the subject-matter, structure and functions of Marxist philosophy. On occasions and up until quite recently, in treating of the history of Marxist philosophy the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy and its historical development was interpreted in an over-extensive way. Marxist philosophy was sometimes identified with the Marxist outlook, whereas the Marxist outlook, the philosophical foundation and methodological basis of which is dialectical and historical materialism, includes, besides these, the theory of scientific communism and Marxist political economy. A number of Marxist works embarked on historical-philosophical research not only into the history of Marxist philosophical and sociological theories and the Marxist method, but also into the history of political views,

* V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 213.

the history of natural science, the history of literature and art, and so forth. The subject-matter of the history of Marxist philosophy was not infrequently made to include the entire history of scientific socialism (communism), while in fact the theory of scientific communism—both in the past and at present—besides philosophical problems, also deals with economic, socio-historical, political, strategic and tactical problems which transcend the subject-matter of philosophy.

Some Marxist writers, too, declare all problems, that neither were nor are directly connected with the theory of knowledge and logic, non-philosophical, excluding from the sphere of philosophy and its history major ideological issues, such as problems of dialectics of nature, problems of sociological theory, the philosophical problems of ethics, aesthetics, etc. In our view, efforts to confine Marxist philosophy and its history mainly to logical and epistemological problems, to reduce Marxist philosophy merely to "knowledge of knowledge", and exclude from it the study of the general objective laws of being (natural and social), as well as Marxist solutions for philosophical and methodological problems of the natural sciences, to withdraw from Marxist philosophy and its history the philosophical aspects of the theory and history of Marxist sociology, ethics and aesthetics, merely serve to divorce philosophical thought from science and revolutionary practice, to oversimplify and devitalise philosophical knowledge.

Equally unsound and erroneous are the attempts made under the pretext of combatting "positivist scientism", incorrectly imputed to many contemporary Marxist works, to reduce Marxist philosophy and its history almost completely to "humanist" problems, make Marxists concentrate mainly on problems of the theory and history of morals, art and religion and pass over general philosophical problems of the development of nature and society, logic of scientific thought, etc.*

* In his *Marxism in the Twentieth Century*, Roger Garaudy declares the problems of morality, art, religion, "philosophical anthropology", etc., to be the main preoccupations of Marxist philosophical thought. This erroneous point of view, which runs counter to the principles of Leninism and ignores the problems concerning the philosophical foundations of the Marxist outlook, the dialectical-materialist reflection

It is more proper, in our view, to understand the subject-matter of the history of Marxist philosophy as an integral and historically developing totality of scientific knowledge concerning the various aspects and functions of Marxist philosophy in their historical development. In this broader sense the history of Marxist philosophy includes not only the history of dialectical materialism as a theory of cognition and logic, but also the history of Marxist philosophical ideas in natural science, the history of the development of historical materialism—the general sociological theory of Marxism, the history of Marxist philosophical ideas in aesthetics and ethics, the history of Marxist atheism, etc.

“Gemmation” of specific branches of philosophical knowledge in Marxism continues and in a number of instances causes independent new sciences to spring up at the point where philosophy and other branches of knowledge (psychology, logic, aesthetics, ethics, sociological sciences, etc.) meet, and this in its turn leads to the emergence of such specialised sciences as the history of psychology, the history of logic, the history of aesthetics, the history of ethics, the history of sociological doctrines, etc. At the same time, in Marxism, the aforementioned sciences, both with respect to the object and method of their research, remain as a rule, philosophical or retain their relationship with philosophy (e.g., the specific sociological sciences which are based on the general sociological theory of historical materialism may be viewed as the “completion” and substantiation of dialectical and historical materialism in the course of its history). The same applies to the history of Marxist philosophy, on whose basis and in close association with which Marxist research develops in the sphere of the history of socialist doctrines, of logic, of aesthetics, of ethical doctrines, etc.

Like any other philosophical science, the history of Marx-

theory, dialectics as the “algebra of revolution”, the methodological basis of the class struggle of the proletariat and other major aspects of Marxist philosophy, is subjected to criticism by French and Soviet Marxist writers. This aspect of the question also attracted the attention of the Yugoslav journal *Dialectics* (No. 1, 1966), which criticised attempts to reduce the philosophical problems to “anthropological humanism” while passing over the “ontological”, logical and other problems of Marxist philosophy (such attempts were made more than once in the pages of *Praxis*).

ist philosophy has a definite structure; like other social sciences, the Marxist history of philosophy has ideological and cognitive (and, to a certain extent, heuristic) aspects which are dialectically united and interrelated.

Elucidation of the cognitive aspect of philosophy, which develops in the course of its history, is the most important element, the nucleus of the history of philosophy. The history of progress in the philosophical cognition of the relation of thought to being, of man to the external world, the history of the establishment of the general laws of motion and development in nature, human society and thought, is the principal content of the history of philosophy as a science. It is, however, entirely wrong to claim, as some people do with no justification, that the subject-matter of the history of philosophy is the entire history of knowledge expressed in logical forms and categories, the history of knowledge *in toto*. Logical forms and categories are used in the history of any branch of knowledge (natural sciences, mathematics, economics, etc.), not only philosophy, and in each of these kinds of knowledge there is a certain measure of generalisation and penetration into the essence of the object reflected. Marxist history of philosophy singles out of the general history of knowledge the philosophic sphere of knowledge, which deals with the theoretical philosophical interpretation of the laws and categories of different spheres of being and thought, without trying either to replace all human knowledge or fuse with it to the exclusion of its independent identity. Marxist history of philosophy studies philosophy not merely as a branch of scientific knowledge but as a definite system of beliefs and ideals based on a scientific system of philosophical laws and categories, on the revolutionary-critical method of materialist dialectics.

The history of Marxist philosophy as a science includes the historiography of Marxist philosophy and the study of sources of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

4. THE PROBLEM OF MAN IN MARX'S PHILOSOPHY

The problem of man which is today central to the most diverse philosophical schools and for which Marxist philosophy provides a scientific solution has long been a tradi-

tional problem of world philosophy. Ever since the Renaissance, when human reason shook off the fetters of scholasticism and obscurantism, the "cosmocentric" themes in philosophy and science, which proclaimed the primacy of nature over man, his reason and will, often clashed with the "anthropocentric" themes in social, including philosophical, thought, i.e., with ideas concerning man's dominating role in nature.

Between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries, anthropocentric ideas in philosophy became closely interwoven with cosmocentric ideas both in materialist and idealist teachings, but neither of these succeeded in bringing to light the dialectics of the world and man, the dialectical unity of "cosmocentric" and "anthropocentric" ideas or providing a clear and correct solution to the problem of man's relation to the external world. Nevertheless, then as in classical antiquity, philosophy was concerned with at least four aspects of the problem of man:

1) Is man but a "speck in the universe", just a part of nature, of the world, subject to its laws and destinies, or is he an active creative being, qualitatively distinct from the surrounding world and able to resist nature and make his mark on the world?

2) Can man cognise the world and himself and turn his knowledge to advantage in "opposing" the surrounding world and mastering its elemental forces or is he wrong to hope to penetrate the "secrets" of the universe and compelled merely to adapt himself to the action of the blind forces of nature and social reality?

3) What is mankind's purpose on this Earth? Is man doomed to suffer the calamities and pain that fall to his lot, to be the slave of the world of natural objects "alienated" from him and of the things and relations of his own making, or can he transform the external world, take into his own hands his relations with nature, intelligently control the relations taking shape among people, and thus achieve freedom and happiness?

4) What is man and what can and should he be? Is he really a being sinful by nature, wallowing in vice and checked solely by his fear of the "coming retribution", or is there a good, pure side to his nature, a capacity for moral

and intellectual regeneration and affirmation of beauty upon Earth?

Thus, the ontological, epistemological, socio-anthropological, ethical and other aspects of the problem of man were the object of philosophical study both in the East and particularly in the West for many centuries. However, no radical solution to these problems existed at that time, nor could it be provided at that time. For many centuries, man was under the virtually undivided sway of feudal absolutist systems and religious ideologies, he was not yet an individual in the full sense of the word, and philosophical quests for a solution to the problem of man and his destiny naturally could not achieve success.

The problem of man, as an object of socio-philosophical research emerges most distinctly in the 17th and 18th centuries, especially in the philosophy of the Enlightenment (Hévétius, Diderot, Lessing, Goethe, Herder and others), which some writers today groundlessly consider to be purely speculative, dogmatic and even far removed from humanism.

In Marx's philosophy, the problem of man was interpreted in a new, scientific way, fundamentally different from the interpretations proffered by either idealist philosophy or speculative metaphysical materialism, as early as 1844-48. In his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx first makes the problem of man the centre of his philosophical and social analysis, without, however, lapsing into either "anthropocentrism" or "cosmocentrism". Marx always regards man dialectically, in the context of the process of historical development and in correlation with the external world—nature and his social environment, the changing of which is the goal of man's practical activities. Only thanks to this external, practical activity which is of a social character does man become what he is and "produce" society. "... The *human* essence of nature first exists only for *social* man; for only here does nature exist for him as a *bond* with *man*—as his existence for the other and the other's existence for him—as the life-element of the human world; only here does nature exist as the *foundation* of his own *human* existence."^{*}

* K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, pp 104-05

There exists extensive Marxist literature on the shaping of Marxist philosophy and the solution it provides to the problem of man.

We shall recall here only some basic ideas involved in the philosophical solution to the problem of man, which is sometimes described as Marx's "philosophy of man" or even "philosophic anthropology", although it would be more correct to trace out the theme of man; it would be inexact to say "anthropological theme"; in all the principal elements of Marx's philosophical doctrine—in "ontology", i.e., in the teaching on the general laws of development of the objective world, in epistemology, logic, in the philosophy of history and sociology, in ethics and aesthetics, and scientific communism.

The main thing distinguishing Marx's solution to the problem of man from naturalistic and idealist pre-Marxist concepts is the concrete-historical and materialist understanding of the essence of man as the ensemble of the social relations founded on human labour, material production and socio-historical revolutionary practice.

According to Marx, the moving force behind the existence and development of man, as distinct from animals, is labour, a concept which includes awareness of its purpose. Labour is a process or act whereby man, in acting upon nature more or less consciously, alters it, simultaneously altering himself. In Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach* it is stated that "the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual . . . it is the ensemble of the social relations".** Amplifying this idea in the third of the *Theses* on Feuerbach Marx elucidates the substantial difference between his own historical-materialist philosophy and previous materialist doctrines.

* See Marx's "*Capital*" and *Philosophy Today*. Moscow, 1968, in Russian; *Karl Marx Biography*, Moscow, 1968, in Russian; A. Cornu, *Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels Leben und Werk*, Berlin, Bd 1-3, 1954-67; N. Lapin, *Young Marx*, Moscow, 1968, in Russian; *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Vol 3, Moscow, 1959 in Russian; T. Oizerman, *Formation of Marxist Philosophy*, Moscow, 1962 in Russian; D. Leković, *Marxistička teorija otuđenja*, Beograd 1968, *Marxistische Philosophie*, Lehrbuch, Leitung und Red. A. Kosing, Berlin, 1967; etc

K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes. Vol. 1. p. 14.

He writes: "The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men that change circumstances and that the educator himself needs educating. Hence, this doctrine necessarily arrives at dividing society into two parts, of which one is superior to society (in Robert Owen, for example).

"The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity," Marx states in contrast to previous materialists, "can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionising practice."*

Approaching man as a social-historical entity Marx always bears in mind the biological, physiological aspect of the human species, which is the result of the long history of nature and which develops in the circumstances of the social environment produced and changed by man. Marx does not reject the conception of "human nature" which previous metaphysical philosophy turned into something eternal and immutable, but he interprets it from a historical standpoint. Marx says that man "must first deal with human nature in general, and then with human nature as modified in each historical epoch".**

Man's activity in the process of which his creative capacities and potential are unfolded is not arbitrary but depends on the material conditions of his social existence; man's freedom, which is cognised necessity, simultaneously appears as the manifestation of man's human essence, and is associated with his personal activities, with the correctly understood interests, ambitions and abilities of man, with his individual personality. Marx is convinced that man "not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realises a purpose of his own that gives the law to his *modus operandi*, and to which he must subordinate his will".*** Linking man's freedom with his power to assert his individuality Marx writes that man "is

K Marx and F Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol 1, pp 13-14

* K Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p 609

** Ibid. p 178

free not through the negative power to avoid this or that, but through the positive power to assert his true individuality".

However, man's freedom, the expression of his personality, comes into conflict with the historically limited conditions prevailing in class societies

Marx, who foresaw that the transition to socialism would bring both general social progress and the progress of the human personality, wrote in that connection: "... the development of the capacities of the *human* species takes place at the cost of the majority of human individuals and even classes, in the end it breaks through this contradiction and coincides with the development of the individual; the higher development of individuality is thus only achieved by a historical process during which individuals are sacrificed."¹

In works by Marx and Engels, especially the early ones, the problem of man is associated with the category of alienation and with "disalienation". Marx had already made clear in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* that in a society based on the social division of labour and private ownership, the fruits of man's thought and actions stand over against him as alien forces. Marx and Engels, who believed that alienation, viewed in historical terms, was a transitory phenomenon, described its essence in antagonistic class societies as "fixation of social activity ... consolidation of what we ourselves produce into an objective power above us, growing out of control, thwarting our expectations and bringing to naught our calculations".²

Capital and other works by Marx, in which the category of alienation is not swept aside but to a large extent is "outtrumped" by a body of scientific, economic and philosophical categories which clarify the very essence of alienation, give an explicit answer concerning the ways and means of putting an end to alienation, which stems from the social division of labour and private ownership, and the ways and forms of passing from the "realm of necessity" into the

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Holy Family*, Moscow, 1956, p. 176.

² K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part II, Moscow, 1968, p. 118.

³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, p. 45.

"realm of freedom". Man's freedom understood in terms of conscious activity fully corresponding to his individual aspirations and propensities, can be attained only in that kind of society which provides the conditions compatible with the essence of man as reformer and builder. Marx and Engels consider that such society is to be found in communism at the higher stage of its development. Marx foresaw that the realm of freedom would only really start when and where work would no longer be dictated by need and external expedience. Yet, the realm of freedom does not do away with the realm of necessity. With man's development 'this realm of physical necessity expands as a result of his wants; but, at the same time, the forces of production which satisfy these wants also increase. Freedom in this field can only consist in socialised man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature . . . and achieving this with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favourable to, and worthy of, their human nature. But it nonetheless still remains a realm of necessity. Beyond it begins that development of human energy which is an end in itself'**.

Marx foresaw that even under socialism, before full-fledged communism was fully attained—the "realm of freedom" in which the "full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle"***,—the time would come when the "associated producers" regulating their "interchange with Nature" would bring it under their joint control instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of nature, that even then conditions would shape that would be worthy of human nature and correspond to its needs.

At the same time Marx and Engels also foresaw that the elimination of all aspects and vestiges of alienation connected with the former division of labour, antithesis be-

* The attitude of Marxism at different stages of its history to the category of alienation and the development of Marx's views on alienation has been discussed by a number of foreign and Soviet Marxists in their works. A sound and detailed exposition of these problems can be found, for example, in I. Narsky's "The Category of Alienation in 'Capital' and Other Works by Marx" (see Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today, Moscow, 1968, pp. 466-98, in Russian).

** K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 779-80.

*** Ibid., Vol. I, p. 592.

tween town and country, between mental and physical labour and the time-lag between changing social conditions and development of consciousness, would be a lengthy, complicated and contradictory process. Overcoming the alienation of man's "ontological forces" in a society of "associated producers" is complicated not only by the tenacious social roots of the old social system but also by the epistemological roots of alienation (religious, fetishistic, and so on), which often causes results of human thought and actions to "appear as independent beings endowed with life" while "their own social action takes the form of the action of objects, which rule the producers instead of being ruled by them".

The solution to the problem of man, furnished in Marx's philosophy, from his early works onwards, is the synthesis of his ideals of socialist humanism rooted in the humanist traditions of world philosophy and social thought, and the scientific philosophical system of views evolved by Marx, directed at the revolutionary transformation of the world.

The development of Marx and Engels' philosophical, sociological and political views after 1844 did not amount in the least to a negation of humanism by science, as some authors maintain, but consisted in the elevation of humanism to the status of a science, whereby the humanism inherited from the past was transformed into real, effective, socialist humanism.

In the current epoch, the problem of man is interpreted in diverse, often diametrically opposed, ways in numerous philosophical conceptions. The Marxist solution to the "problem of man" is quite different from the existentialist approach to the problem and that of "philosophical anthropology", religious-philosophical doctrines of man, pragmatist and positivist-scientistic conceptions, and so on.

Contemporary "anthropological" concepts, as a rule, divorce man, his essence, his psychological make-up, etc., from his social environment. Noting the alienation of man's "ontological powers" from him in modern society, many philosophers in the West argue that it is an inevitable consequence of the very fact of man's existence in society. From this derives the opposition of the individual to society,

• Ibid , pp. 72, 75.

extreme individualism and anarchism, the proclamation of complete freedom for the individual divorced from radical changes in society and sometimes, even, defying the interests of society and running counter to the practical efforts of progressive forces to promote man's emancipation.

Some contemporary Western philosophers, when they start discussing man, indulge in romantic fancies, turn the individual into the world's creator and motive force, regarding man as the "creation mirror" that produces, creates out of itself the object before it and reflects nothing save what it itself has created.

Social pessimism, fear of the future, is the dominant theme of many conceptions touching upon the problem of man. The West German philosopher Gert von Natzmer writes that "the history of civilisation tells of man's attempt to erect an artificial world above nature, to build a world edifice, as it were, into which he could withdraw like a mollusc into its shell.... In the conditions of modern civilisation man increasingly finds himself at the mercy of impersonal, anonymous forces. What was once a means now threatens to subjugate him. In this crisis of our times the problems of our entire human existence seem to have grown acute and thus all the more obvious".* Some of the contemporary adepts of philosophical idealism, such as, for example, the proponents of its scientific-positivist variety, confine themselves to specific problems and consider the "anthropological" alarm over man's future and the fate of the humanist ideals of the past and present unfounded. At the same time a considerable proportion of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois thinkers abroad are casting doubtful and fearful glances at the progress of science and technology, universalising "anthropocentrism" in philosophy, pouring scorn on the scientific interpretation of the objective laws of history, and separating the individual's destiny from the struggle for complete control of science and technology, natural and social forces.

The history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and of the world communist movement shows that the problem of man, scientifically substantiated for the first time in the

* G von Natzmer, *Weisheit der West*, Berlin, 1954, S. 366-67.

works of Marx and Engels, was creatively developed by Lenin and the Marxists of the present historical epoch. As a result of the proletarian revolution and the building of socialism and communism, the ideals of socialist humanism, linked by indissoluble ties with the life-asserting philosophy of Marxism, have come into their own.

5. DIVISION INTO PERIODS AND THE OBJECTIVE LAWS OF THE HISTORY OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY; THE CONTINUITY OF ITS TRADITIONS

Marxist philosophy approaches its own history—as all real phenomena and knowledge—from the standpoint of materialist dialectics which requires that every object and phenomenon should be considered historically, in the course of its development, and in relation to other phenomena and concrete historical experience. In applying the dialectical method to the history of Marxism and its philosophy we proceed from the following premises:

1) the history of Marxism and its philosophy develop as an international process at all their stages; periods of the history of Marxism and its philosophy are not differentiated on the territorial principle, although some would-be Marxists emphasise the latter out of all proportion and claim that at one time or another a country or group of countries becomes the hegemon of the revolutionary movement and sets the tone, as it were, for Marxist thought everywhere (as, for example, in “theories” concerning the hegemony of “German Marxism”, “Russian Marxism”, “Eastern Marxism”, the “Marxism of the countries assuming the initiative of the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle”, etc.). In actual fact, however, the division of the history of Marxism into periods depends on the difference between historical epochs and stages that is due to the distinctive character and level of social development and the revolutionary movement in each of them;

2) the history of Marxism and its philosophy is not a history of particular individuals and thinkers, albeit eminent ones, but of a process of the collective thought and action of the communist movement; that is why it is divided into periods in accordance with the actual content

and forms of development of Marxist philosophical ideas and conceptions in keeping with the needs of the revolutionary struggle and the progress of science;

3) the history of Marxist philosophy does not imply any "exclusive" or predominant development of any one problem or aspect of dialectical materialism but involves the all-round development of philosophical thought as a historical totality of many facets, aspects, problems and concepts of philosophy. That is why it is wrong to divide the history of Marxist philosophy into periods on the basis of singling out schematically and arbitrarily this or that problem, important as it may be (e.g., the problem of man and the alienation of his "ontological powers"; the problem of "revolutionary action", of logical cognition, and so on). It is also wrong to reduce the entire history of Marxist philosophy to that problem alone, passing over all other problems and aspects of philosophy. The division of Marxist philosophy into periods must be founded on the historical totality of the philosophical principles, ideas and conceptions of Marxism in their mutual relationship at each stage of development of society and the communist movement.

Proceeding from these criteria contemporary Marxist writers divide the history of Marxism, including its philosophy, into three major periods: 1) the formation and development of Marxism in the epoch of the pre-monopoly capitalism (from the mid-1840s until approximately the end of the nineteenth century); 2) the spread and development of Marxism during the epoch of imperialism (from the end of the nineteenth century until the 1917 October Revolution); 3) the subsequent development and dissemination of Marxism in the new historical epoch—the collapse of imperialism following the victorious socialist and national liberation revolutions, the epoch of the struggle between two social systems, socialist and capitalist, and the building of communism (after October, 1917). The second and third epochs in the history of Marxism constitute the new, i.e., the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism and its philosophy.

Besides confining themselves to the division of the history of Marxism into three principal periods, the authors of many contemporary Marxist works single out within the

framework of these periods shorter historical stages of the development of Marxist philosophy in the Soviet Union and elsewhere." Thus the period of development of Marxism and its philosophy under pre-monopoly capitalism is subdivided into three historical stages: 1) the formation of Marxist philosophy in the period before the revolutions of 1848 in Europe; 2) the assertion and development of Marxist philosophy in the works of Marx and Engels in the period between the revolutions of 1848-49 and the Paris Commune of 1871; 3) the subsequent spread and development of Marxist philosophy in the period between the Paris Commune and the beginning of the imperialist epoch (the late nineteenth century). At each of these stages a change took place in the content and form (kind) of the materialist philosophy of Marx and Engels.

The history of the philosophy of Marxism, as of its other components, has dramatically demonstrated the general law to which the functioning of scientific, and so philosophical, doctrines is subject, whereby they must be continually and creatively developed, revitalised and improved, and must confront and find correct solutions for fresh problems. This law was thoroughly mastered and applied by the founders of Marxism, who considered their theory to be a guide to action, not a cut-and-dried, immutable system. Development of the philosophy and doctrine of Marxism in general does not require in the least that Marxism, the system and method of its philosophy should acquire any particular, specific national forms for each particular country or group of countries. The very subject of Marxist philosophy is of a general, universal character, since it studies the dialectics of general relationships and the more general laws of development. The general laws of development operating in the sphere of nature are fundamentally the same for people of different countries and nations.

With reference to the social sphere, dialectical materialism is also concerned not with the details of a country's history but with the more general laws of social development (the decisive role of material production and social being with respect to social consciousness, of the economic

* See Chapters III, IV and V.

basis with relation to the superstructure, the growing role played by the masses in history, etc.). These general laws of social development, despite the great diversity of forms of social life in different countries, dominate in the world at each given stage of its history (feudalism, pre-monopoly capitalism, imperialism, socialism).

With reference to the sphere of thought Marxist philosophy, which draws general conclusions from the historical experience of scientific knowledge and social thought, law, morality, art and other forms of social consciousness, aims at disclosing above all the general laws governing the entire process of logical thinking and mankind's psychological and spiritual development, and to trace out new trends in the development of world science and culture.

Formulas, occasionally put forward in certain countries, to the effect that Marxism, including its philosophy, necessarily develops in national forms, as well as the hypothesis concerning the prevalence of specifically national sources of development of Marxist philosophy in a country or group of countries are, in our opinion, unsound. While Marxism, which came into being in Germany, had its national sources in classical German philosophy, it also drew on French utopian socialism, which goes back to the French Enlightenment and materialism of the eighteenth century, and on English classical political economy. Engels pointed out that the German socialists took great pride in being heirs to the ideas of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, as well as those of Kant, Fichte, Hegel.* Marxism emerged in Germany on a foundation of generalised experience of the West European and international revolutionary movements, of the experience of world history in general. In the course of its historical development, it spread in other countries; with due respect for the historical distinctive features, national traditions, and the experience of class struggle in these countries Marxism became the theoretical foundation of the development of the international working-class and communist movement. Of course Marxism in each country absorbs the best traditions of science, revolutionary thought and pre-Marxist philosophy (for example, of the revolu-

* Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd 19, Berlin, 1962, S. 188.

nationals democrats in Russia in the nineteenth century, and critically interprets their legacy. This, however, does not mean that such pre-Marxist socio-political and philosophical theories along with Marx's dialectical materialism become the foundation or principal source of development of Marxist philosophy in the country concerned. Just as the philosophy of Marx and Engels is not merely a German or West European doctrine, so Leninism, which was born in Russia and which furthers and develops the international Marxist doctrine in the new epoch of world history, is not merely Russian or Eastern Marxism.

There may be and there are in history certain specific aspects of development of Marxism in one country or another. Thus, Lenin had every reason to mention the historical peculiarities of the development of Marxism in Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The development of Marxism in different countries reflects historical peculiarities of the manifestation of general laws of social development in one country or another, the specific national and cultural traditions of individual peoples, the historical experience of the revolutionary and labour movements in their countries. However, the presence of such peculiarities, which are taken into account by Marxism and its philosophy and find expression in certain specific features of the application of the general principles of Marxism, neither can nor should make us forget the main characteristic of Marxist philosophy—the universal character of the laws of development that form its subject-matter at any historical stage, in any country. Marxist philosophy may evolve, be enriched by new findings and acquire a new scientific aspect, but that happens not by dint of any national or geographical distinctions in the development of the revolutionary movement and theory but as a result of fundamental changes in society and revolutions in science. That was exactly what Engels had in mind when he wrote that materialism evolves with every epoch-making discovery in the field of natural science. The proposition that materialism evolves should—proceeding from the principles of Marxism—also be applied to great social upheavals such as bring about substantial changes in the content and form of philosophy. This applies not only to the history of pre-Marxist

philosophy, in which Engels traced out the development of such trends of philosophy as the materialism of the classical thinkers of antiquity, and the metaphysical materialism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but also to the philosophy of Marxism itself, to dialectical materialism. Dialectical and historical materialism, which took shape in the middle of the nineteenth century, retained its initial form until the end of that century, which, however, underwent considerable change in the early twentieth century when as a result of the transition to the new historical epoch—imperialism—and the scientific revolution that took place at the turn of the century, Marxist philosophy passed to a higher stage, providing scientific substantiation for new social processes (of the imperialist epoch), a new theory of socialist revolution, and new epoch-making scientific discoveries. This step forward was accomplished by Lenin. But even within the framework of that form of dialectical materialism which was developed under pre-monopoly capitalism in the latter half of the nineteenth century by Marx and Engels and their followers, certain modifications of Marxist philosophy were introduced.

The dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels in the forties was a scientific materialist outlook based on the dialectical principle of development that served as the “algebra of revolution”, as a theoretical substantiation of the proletariat’s role in democratic revolutions, but at that time they had not yet disclosed the laws of capitalist economic and social development nor drawn general philosophical conclusions from them, and the discoveries made by natural scientists in the nineteenth century still required philosophical interpretation.

In the sixties, in Marx’s *Capital*, dialectical materialism acquired a new scientific aspect, in as far as the principles of dialectical materialism were consistently applied to the study of the capitalist formation and were brilliantly vindicated; the logic of *Capital* is a new, historical-materialist type of dialectical principle of development, a further advance of the Marxist method of materialist dialectics.

In the works of Marx and Engels written in the 70s-90s of the 19th century (*Critique of the Gotha Programme*, *Anti-Dühring*, *Dialectics of Nature*, *Ludwig Feuerbach*...),

Engels' letters on historical materialism, etc. . dialectical and historical materialism, as a result of its further development, again acquired a new scientific aspect. Systematic exposition of dialectical materialism as a science, formulation of the principal laws and main categories of dialectics, dialectical materialist synthesis of the achievements of natural science in the nineteenth century, all-round and systematic elaboration of historical materialism (especially of the problems of the class struggle, the state and ideologies, and the philosophical substantiation on this basis of the means of revolutionary transition from capitalism to communism, all testified that dialectical and historical materialism, pursuing its principles and expressed in those of its ideas and concepts which had been taking shape since the mid-1840s, had enriched and substantiated its content, acquiring a new scientific aspect.

The history of Marxist philosophy in the nineteenth century, as well as its subsequent development in the current epoch, shows that the changing aspect of modern Marxist materialism is due not to the national peculiarities of the development of philosophy in different countries but to the new processes and phenomena in world social development, the international revolutionary movement of the proletariat, in world science. That is why many Marxists are profoundly convinced that raising the question of the "national forms" of Marxist philosophy, is unsound and in practice serves to disunite the various contingents of the world communist movement and the theory they profess.

General laws and the more essential features of development characteristic of the Marxist doctrine as a whole manifest themselves and are embodied in the history of dialectical materialism as a component part of Marxism. In the nineteenth century, these essential features of the Marxist doctrine, which in the course of time became objective laws of its development, were: dependence of the content and form of Marxism on the class struggle of the proletariat and, in the last analysis, on the development of the capitalist mode of production; the indissoluble unity of scientific theory and revolutionary ideology expressing the basic interests and world outlook of the working class; close association between the development of Marxist scientific

theory and the revolutionary practice of the working class and the popular liberation movements; the relationship between Marxist theory and specific sciences of society and nature: the completeness of Marxist theory whose component parts—philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism—present a unified whole; the continuity of progressive traditions of science and social thought in Marxism which inherits, continues and develops these traditions; the consistent commitment of Marxist theory and its relentless ideological struggle against reactionary ideology and anti-Marxist views in the working-class movement.

The *particular objective laws* of the development of philosophical thought that are inherent in all its trends in antagonistic class societies, especially under capitalism, also apply to the history of Marxist philosophy. They are: the struggle between materialism and idealism—two principal trends or parties in philosophy; the dependence of the form and content of philosophy on natural scientific discoveries: the correlation between method and theory in philosophy, which, as a rule, conflicted in pre-Marxist philosophical systems but form a unified whole in Marxist philosophy: the transmission of “conceptual material” from preceding philosophical systems and the development on this basis of logical categories and conceptions of new philosophical systems and doctrines; the increasing influence of philosophy on science, social thought and man’s intellectual life. Characteristic of Marxist philosophy is the following essential new feature which is becoming an objective law of its development: in dialectical materialism philosophy turns from an “esoteric” doctrine accessible to a narrow group of thinkers, scientists and revolutionaries into the ideological-theoretical foundation for the mental awareness and practical activity of thousands, and then millions of people, becoming the ideological banner of the foremost social movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—the socialist movement of the working class.

Thus in the history of philosophical thought a new, strong and viable tradition emerges and grows—philosophy becomes the intellectual weapon of the proletariat, of the broad masses. It comes to indicate the path of the revolutionary transformation of society and turns into a strong

and real historical force, into "philosophy of action", philosophy of practice" Marx wrote in early 1844, in his first work written from the standpoint of dialectical materialism—in the Introduction to *From the Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right*: "The weapon of criticism cannot of course replace criticism by weapons, the material force must be overthrown by material force; however, theory becomes a material force as soon as it has seized the masses

The above-mentioned specific patterns of development to be observed in social theory in general and philosophy in particular constitute a manifestation of universal laws of the dialectical development of being and knowledge to which the history of Marxist philosophy is also subject.

The works of Marx and Engels dealt with such key points of the history of philosophy as not only "interrupt rectilinear motion" by presenting new solutions to traditional philosophical problems but also mark the appearance of fresh philosophical problems which have also to be solved.

Noting the fact that in each epoch philosophy has for its prerequisite specific conceptual material, passed on by the philosophy of the past, Engels wrote: "And that is why economically backward countries can still play first fiddle in philosophy: France in the eighteenth century as compared with England, on whose philosophy the French based themselves, and later Germany as compared with both. But in France as well as Germany philosophy and the general blossoming of literature at that time were the result of a rising economic development."***

That the development of philosophy in certain forms is dialectically contradictory, uneven and spasmodic is also obvious from the fact that dialectical and historical materialism in the 1840s-80s, which constituted the philosophical synthesis of European and, to a certain extent, world history and science, emerged and developed in Germany which was backward in comparison with other Western countries. The same contradiction was to be observed later on, in the twentieth century, especially after the Russian revolution of

Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd 1, S 385.

K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence* Moscow, 1965, p 424.

1905, when the centre of the international revolutionary movement and development of Marxist theory shifted to Russia—a country with a “middle to poor” level of capitalism, as Lenin said, which economically speaking was less developed than the capitalist countries of Western Europe. The emergence of Leninism in Russia, which synthesised the experience of world history in the imperialist epoch and the epoch-making triumphs of science in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the philosophical substantiation of the new theory of socialist revolution, to which revolutionary Russia was paving the way,—all this serves to confirm the thesis of the founders of scientific communism to the effect that dialectical development of philosophical thought, including Marxist thought, is relatively independent, uneven and contradictory.

The history of Marxist philosophy, as other philosophical doctrines, reveals, to use Lenin's term, the “dialectical element”, i.e., the operation of the laws of dialectics. This is clear even from the emergence of Marxism as a revolutionary landmark, a leap forward in the history of philosophy and social thought, the development of the qualitatively new philosophy of dialectical materialism which is a negation of the earlier philosophy of metaphysical materialism and idealist dialectics and which at the same time constitutes a critical assimilation and refashioning of the most valuable trends of earlier philosophy, of its “conceptual material”. The dialectical nature of the many-sided and self-contradictory development of Marxist philosophy also manifests itself in the fact that in the course of its criticism of the ideas and conceptions of earlier bourgeois philosophy, surmounted and negated by Marxism, the development of its own philosophical thought follows a helical line, since earlier philosophical knowledge and categories are incorporated as relative truths and stable logical thought patterns into the system of philosophical knowledge and conceptions of dialectical materialism. Marxism has the creative capacity to select from science, philosophy, social thought and culture valuable, rational elements, to interpret them critically and assess them correctly from the standpoint of the revolutionary proletariat. One of the inalienable features and laws of development of Marxist philosophy

consists in "the *development* of the best models, traditions and results of the *existing* culture, *from the point of view* of the Marxist world outlook and the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat in the period of its dictatorship".

The struggle between materialism and idealism determines the development of philosophy in class societies and enriches the content of philosophical knowledge, but it will not remain an eternal feature of the history of philosophy. As dialectical and historical materialism and the scientific materialist outlook based on it gain a firm hold over men's minds, ousting backward, religious, idealist, and other unscientific views, and communist society is established on a universal scale, there will be no need for the two schools in philosophy—materialism and idealism—or for their struggle. In the current historical epoch the correlation of materialism and idealism has already changed considerably. Whereas before the October Revolution modern materialism, i.e., Marxist materialism, was accessible to a relatively small number of proletarian revolutionaries, was the ideological banner of the most progressive parties and members of the working class while idealism dominated philosophy almost completely, now, fifty years after the October Revolution the situation is altogether different. Millions of Communists in countries all over the world, thousands of prominent figures in the sphere of science and culture, and the masses in the socialist countries follow the principles of Marxism and its philosophy, mastering the scientific materialist outlook and basing their lives and activities on it. Idealist, including religious, world outlooks, and philosophical idealism have been steadily losing support over recent decades, although they still retain considerable influence.

While some idealist philosophers at times raise important philosophical problems and search for truth, on the whole, philosophical idealism in the current epoch, as historical experience shows, is unable to provide a correct, scientific and practicable solution for any of the cardinal problems of philosophy. The role of scientific philosophy in supplying answers to the philosophical theoretical questions of the present age is now performed by dialectical and historical

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 217

materialism. From this pattern inherent in the contemporary development of philosophy it follows that idealism has no future, that it is not eternal, and that with the triumph of communism on a world scale it is bound to become a thing of the past.

We consider erroneous the views expressed on this point by some contemporary dogmatic philosophers, in China, for example. Proceeding from the fact that contradictions have existed everywhere and at all times, that thought may "fly away" from truth, and truth may come into conflict with misconceptions, they argue that even under full-fledged communism the struggle of dialectical materialism against idealism is natural and inevitable. In fact, however, although people may draw wrong conclusions, may deviate from the truth and make mistakes, including those of an idealist nature, under communism as before, the existence of idealist views and moreover development of idealist philosophy will not be necessary or natural during the higher phase of communism for the social foundation of such a struggle will no longer exist. In such circumstances, idealist views may continue in one form or another for some time as a survival from the former social system and the idealist outlook of the past; subsequently, however, philosophical idealism which belongs to the past will exist merely as an object of scientific study.

**6. TRADITIONS OF MARX AND ENGELS
CARRIED FORWARD BY NINETEENTH-CENTURY
MARXIST PHILOSOPHERS (PLEKHANOV, PAUL LAFARGUE,
FRANZ MEHRING AND OTHERS)**

Even in the 19th century Marxist philosophical tradition was not confined merely to the works of the founders of dialectical and historical materialism. This tradition was supported and carried forward, as far as some of its points were concerned, during the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism and in the early twentieth century by well-known scholars and revolutionaries—the followers of Marx and Engels, in particular Paul Lafargue in France, Franz Mehring in Germany and Plekhanov in Russia. Along with Engels, who engaged in most vigorous political and philo-

sophical-theoretical activity right up to his death in 1895. These and other leaders and theoreticians of the Social-Democratic labour movement (Joseph Dietzgen, August Bebel, Karl Schorlemmer, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and, for some time, Karl Kautsky in Germany, Antonio Labriola in Italy, the Avelings in Britain, Dmitr Blagoev in Bulgaria, etc.) disseminated Marxist ideas, philosophical as well, and criticised to varying extents anti-Marxist ideology finding its way into the working-class movement.

The Frenchman, *Paul Lafargue*, Marx's closest associate and follower, was one of the first to support and propagate the materialist philosophical tradition of Marx and Engels. Between 1880 and the 1900s, Lafargue defended and expounded in his works, that prepared the ground for his major philosophical opus *Le déterminisme économique de Karl Marx* (*Economic Determinism of Karl Marx*) (1909), Marx's philosophical materialism demonstrating the class, revolutionary trend of Marx's doctrine, explaining the unsound and harmful nature of attempts to "synthesise" Marxism with certain varieties of "neo-Platonism" (Jean Jaurès) or "neo-Kantianism" (Eduard Bernstein), and so on. He demonstrated that bourgeois intellectuals would revive the idealist traditions of Plato, Kant and other philosophers of the past in order by extolling these idealist doctrines to "water down" the materialism of Marx and Engels. Lafargue subjects to scathing and persuasive criticism the agnosticism of the bourgeois philosophy of the late nineteenth century, inspired by Kant, social agnosticism in particular, as well as the vulgar evolutionist conceptions put forward by positivists and social-Darwinists in opposition to Marx's revolutionary dialectics. He wrote that many people, positivists among them, believed that evolution and revolution were two opposite and mutually exclusive forms of development; in fact, however, they were mutually supplementary. In reply to those who accused Marx of "Hegelianism" and sought to deprive Marxism of its revolutionary dialectical core Lafargue elucidated the contrast between Marx's dialectical method and Hegel's.

Lafargue played a major part in the struggle against anarchism in defence of Marxist traditions with regard to the revolutionary organisation and struggle of the prole-

ariat. 'So long as society is divided into antagonistic classes,' he wrote, 'that is, so long as there is a class to contain, the existence of the state is inevitable, and neither the holy water of free trade nor anarchist exorcisms can destroy it.'² On another occasion Lafargue, while defending Marx's theory of proletarian dictatorship, wrote that the day the proletariat of Europe and America would take control of the state, it would have to organise revolutionary government and set up a dictatorship to rule society until the bourgeoisie had disappeared as a class.

Unlike Bernstein, Millerand and other Second International opportunists, who substituted for the revolutionary doctrine of Marx and Engels ideas of bourgeois parliamentarianism and haphazard reformist "improvement" of capitalism, calling for the adapting of the working-class movement to the existing order, etc., Lafargue till his dying day defended the class, party tradition of Marxism, urging the proletariat to adhere to revolutionary ideology and make ready to smash capitalist society.

Marxist philosophical tradition was consistently and effectively carried forward and defended for forty years by *Franz Mehring*, a prominent revolutionary theoretician of Social Democracy in Germany. Many of Mehring's Marxist works, including his *Die Lessing-Legende*, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, *Karl Marx. Geschichte seines Lebens*, deal with the history of philosophy and social thought. Mehring tirelessly defended the finest philosophical and cultural traditions of the German people from a proletarian standpoint, and, most important of all, he defended the purity and revolutionary significance of Marx's doctrine. With this aim in mind, Mehring criticised the German Katheder-Socialists and other ideologists of the liberal bourgeoisie (Brentano, Sombart and others), revisionists of the Bernstein, K. Vorländer mould and so on, who sought to belittle the philosophical significance of Marxism, declaring it "not independent" and lacking philosophical "substantiation" and "calling to the rescue" bourgeois idealist philosophy, in particular neo-Kantianism. Coming out against

² P. Lafargue, *Le déterminisme économique de Karl Marx*, t. III, p. 14.

such philosophical omnivorousness Mehring demonstrated that philosophy is one of the ideological forms in which people perceived the class struggle, and that only consistently revolutionary Marxism can provide the necessary ideological form of class consciousness for the proletariat. Unlike the ideologists of Social Democracy and the Second International who divorced theory from practice, philosophy from real life, Mehring stressed that it was vital for the working-class movement to adhere to Marx's tradition of the unity of theoretical thought and revolutionary action that had already proved itself in practice. Mehring stressed that "Marx's singular greatness rested in large measure on the fact that in him the thinker and the man of action were inseparably linked, complementing and sustaining each other".*

Whereas some Social-Democratic theoreticians, including Karl Kautsky, tended to approximate to some extent Marx's proletarian outlook and the bourgeois outlook of his precursors, while some Social-Democratic philosophers (in both Germany and Russia) considered Marx's philosophy to be a simple combination of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism, Mehring, who carried forward the tradition of Marx and Engels, succeeded as a rule in picking out the fundamental difference between their philosophy on the one hand and the materialism of the past and the dialectical tradition of German idealism on the other. Mehring wrote that "Marx had borrowed neither Hegel's dialectical method nor Feuerbach's abstract materialism uncritically. He upset the former by showing that ideas were not embodied in things, but that things were mirrored in ideas. He expanded the latter point into historical materialism, showing how the endless stream of the dialectical process was operating in it".** Simultaneously Mehring vigorously supported—especially while criticising the vulgar materialism of Büchner, Moleschott and Vogt—Hegel's dialectical tradition, assimilated and critically refashioned by Marx and Engels.

Mehring strove to follow the tradition of creative de-

* F. Mehring, "Karl Marx. Geschichte seines Lebens", *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 3, Berlin, 1960, S. 5.

** F. Mehring, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1960, S. 285.

velopment of philosophy founded by Marx and Engels, especially in the sphere of historical materialism, stating that "historical materialism is not a closed system crowned by ultimate truth; it is a scientific method suitable for investigating the process of mankind's development".*

Like Engels, Mehring studied the relatively independent progress of literature and art, morals, the history of philosophy and social thought, their interdependence and retroaction on the economy and class struggle. This means that his philosophical and sociological works have nothing in common with the concepts of "economic materialism" which became widespread towards the end of the nineteenth century, even among some Marxists, who, Mehring wrote, sought to squeeze the "singularly rich and complex life of mankind into a barren formula"*** and who approached the materialist interpretation of history in a stereotyped way, which "led to distortions of the truth as much as any other stereotyped view of the philosophy of history".***

Franz Mehring underlined that "if the economic facts are decisive in the *last* instance, they still may be influenced by ideological notions as well; and that if ideology is incapable of *independent* action, that does not by any means imply it is incapable of any action at all".***

While carrying forward the traditions of the founders of Marxism and spreading their materialist doctrine Franz Mehring, like Paul Lafargue, did not, however, pay due attention to dialectics as the epistemology and logic of Marxism. Often he failed to discriminate properly between the dialectical-materialist epistemology of Marx and that of earlier materialism (Spinoza, Holbach, Feuerbach) and saw the principal advantage of Marxism over this materialism in its materialist interpretation of history.

An important role in the continuation and promotion of the philosophical tradition of Marx and Engels in the Russian and international labour movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was played by *Georgi Plekhanov*.

* F Mehring, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd 13., Berlin 1961, S 316.

** Ibid., S 312

*** Ibid., S. 335.

**** Ibid., S. 287.

At a time when in many parties of the Second International Social-Democratic leaders and theoreticians showed little concern for philosophy in general, were indifferent—or worse—to Marxist philosophy and tolerated idealism and revisionism, Plekhanov, especially during the first twenty years of his activities as a Marxist (1883-1903), defended from the standpoint of consistent dialectical materialism the traditions of militant materialism, revolutionary dialectics of social development, theoretical ideological opposition to the philosophy of anti-Marxists and revisionists.

In the 1890s, Plekhanov criticised some Social-Democratic theoreticians of the Second International for treating Marxist philosophy with contempt and their liberal attitude to alien philosophical views then penetrating the working-class movement. In 1896, he wrote in a letter to Karl Kautsky: "...Marxists are extremely rare birds in Western socialist parties. This is really most regrettable."* In 1898, in another letter, he criticised Kautsky and other leaders of the German Social Democrats for their indifferent attitude to the defence of Marxist philosophy against bourgeois criticism. He wrote: "...I support the ideas of Marx and Engels and ... it would be unpardonable if we surrendered at the first attack from some University pedants. ... You say your readers take no interest in philosophy. I think they should be made to *take an interest in it*".**

Shortly before his death Engels set great store by the appearance in Russia of the first Marxist organisation, the Emancipation of Labour group, founded by Plekhanov in 1883. Plekhanov and his followers were the first Russian Marxists to break with the idealist and subjectivist traditions of the Narodniks and adopt the stand of scientific socialism, dialectical and historical materialism. In a letter distinguished by considerable foresight Engels wrote to Vera Zasulich: "I am proud to know that there is a party among the youth of Russia which frankly and without equivocation accepts the great economic and historical theories of Marx

* *The Emancipation of Labour Group*, Book 5, Moscow-Leningrad, 1926, p. 216 (in Russian)

** G. Plekhanov, *Philosophic Heritage*, Selected Works, in five volumes, Vol. V, Moscow, 1934-38, p. 283 (in Russian)

and has decisively broken with all the anarchist and more or less Slavophile traditions of its predecessors.... It is an advance which will be of great importance for the revolutionary development of Russia. To me the historical theory of Marx is the fundamental condition of all *reasoned* and *consistent* revolutionary tactics...."¹

Towards the end of the 19th century Plekhanov wrote a number of works for both Russian and West European readers, in particular *Socialism and Political Struggle*, *On Our Differences*, *Essays on the History of Materialism*, *The Development of the Monist View of History*, *Materialist Interpretation of History*, *Sixty Years after Hegel*, and the collection *Our Critics Criticised*), in which he subjected to scientific analysis vast material on the history of philosophy and social thought, and demonstrated that Marxism had inherited and critically reappraised the most valuable achievements of world culture and European philosophical and social doctrines. Plekhanov was well aware of the qualitative difference peculiar to the philosophy of the new, proletarian epoch in the development of the liberation movement, of the "most recent materialism", i.e., Marxism, from the philosophy that had gone before it. He noted more than once that Marx's philosophy was not merely the "intellectual hallmark" of its epoch but an ideological weapon for changing the world. "If philosophy cognises merely what is obsolescent and old, its knowledge is *one-sided*," he wrote, "and it is unable to fulfil its task of cognising existence.... The most recent type of materialism does not go to this extreme. On the strength of what *there is* and what has had its day it can judge of what is *taking shape*."²

Plekhanov sometimes committed errors in his definitions of Marxist philosophy and its attitude to earlier doctrines. Nevertheless he was the first to refer to the philosophy of Marx and Engels as a true revolution in philosophy and demonstrate how it differed fundamentally from earlier metaphysical materialism and idealist dialectics.

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 384.

² G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophic Works*, in five volumes, Vol. 1, Moscow, p. 144 (in Russian).

In many of his works Plekhanov discloses the continuity of the finest traditions of philosophical and social thought, above all such as the development of humanist ideals, historical optimism scientifically substantiating man's faith in the coming emancipation of the masses and their free and happy future; the transition in philosophical thought from contemplation of reality to energetic purposeful activity, to a conscious transformation of the world in the interests of society and man; the indissoluble link between materialist philosophy and science and the gradual ousting of prejudice, superstition, religious and other retrograde views from man's intellectual life; the growing role of the scientific, materialist outlook in man's intellectual life, etc.

Waging an ideological struggle against petty-bourgeois utopian concepts put forward by the Narodniks, who claimed to be the followers of Herzen, Belinsky and Chernyshevsky and the sole custodians of their traditions, Plekhanov in his works on Chernyshevsky, Belinsky, Herzen and other revolutionary Russian nineteenth-century thinkers demonstrated that for all the historical limitations of the social views held by Herzen and Chernyshevsky, who pinned their hopes on the socialist character of the peasant revolution and village commune in Russia, the most valuable theoretical legacy left by Chernyshevsky in the sphere of philosophy and aesthetics, which was fundamentally of a materialist and dialectical nature, foreshadowed not the ideas of the Narodniks but the aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat, Marxism. The outstanding and most significant features of the philosophical and social-political tradition carried forward by the Russian revolutionary nineteenth-century thinkers were their unswerving devotion to the people and their appeal for revolutionary action, their support of the class struggle, their opposition to reaction and criticism of liberalism, their deep esteem for science, revolutionary theory and realistic, truly popular art. Their most significant achievements in the sphere of philosophy are militant materialism and the understanding of dialectics as the "algebra of revolution" (which Plekhanov called the "viable element of materialist dialectics"), their progressive, realistic principles in aesthetics, their democratic internationalism and support of the proletariat's struggle. These finest

traditions of the Russian revolutionary nineteenth-century thinkers were expounded and promoted by Plekhanov on a new, scientific-socialist foundation, from the philosophical position of dialectical and historical materialism.

Plekhanov disproved (if not always consistently) the Slavophile and liberal Narodnik notions to the effect that the development of culture and social thought in Russia, unlike the West, had resembled a "single stream" allegedly devoid of any internal contradictions, class struggle or antagonism of ideologies. He set out to demonstrate in his works that Russian philosophy and social thought had been developing in the process of struggle between progressive ideas and conservative and reactionary ideology, between materialism and idealism, a struggle which reflected the acute contradictions existing between the classes of Russian society.

"A working-class ideologist today," Plekhanov wrote, "*has no right to be indifferent to philosophy...* Our bourgeois theoreticians manage skilfully enough to clothe in philosophical garb the anti-proletarian aspect of their views. To defeat them, one must also be able to fight them with philosophical weapons... The philosophical garb in which the anti-proletarian part of present-day bourgeois doctrines is clothed is steeped through and through in *idealism*. Philosophical idealism is now a conservative (in the *social* sense) intellectual weapon."^{***}

Plekhanov regarded the "latest" bourgeois conceptions of philosophical idealism as a reaction to the revolutionary class struggle, the proletarian movement and Marx's materialism, a reaction that was capable of penetrating the working-class movement to which it was alien by nature. "... Modern West European philosophy in which the bourgeoisie is so strongly dominant cannot but be the self-expression of the latter," he wrote. "Unfortunately, even

* Later, after 1903, when Plekhanov became a Menshevik, in the 2nd edition of his book on Chernyshevsky (1911) and in his unfinished *History of Russian Social Thought* (1914-17), he abandoned these fundamental Marxist propositions, withdrawing some of his critical remarks with regard to Russian liberalism.

** G. Plekhanov, *Collected Works*, in 24 volumes, Vol. 18, Moscow-Leningrad, p. 294 (in Russian).

people who, generally speaking, side with the working class are now slow to appreciate this truth which is extremely simple. That is why these people, both here and in Western Europe, very often eagerly spread philosophical doctrines that are the last word in bourgeois reaction spearheaded against the proletariat's liberation aspirations."

Like Engels, Plekhanov expressed the profound idea that "it is *idealism*, not *dialectics*, that modern natural science disproves. Since dialectics itself is becoming *materialist*, as we see in the works of Marx and Engels, it thus in all respects represents the very method applied by the modern sciences of nature and society—natural science and sociology. But contemporary natural scientists and sociologists for the most part apply their method unconsciously and therefore have no proper idea either of the method itself or of its great significance".** Plekhanov believed that a working-class revolution would emancipate science and open up boundless vistas for its further progress and the practical application of its discoveries.

Although Plekhanov did not draw general philosophical conclusions from the scientific discoveries made at the turn of the century and did not attribute due significance to dialectics as a theory of cognition and logic, thus failing to elaborate thoroughly the dialectical tradition of the philosophy of Marx and Engels, it would be wrong and unjust to accuse him of dogmatism, because it should be remembered that he, especially during the first twenty years of his activities as a Marxist (1883-1903), carried forward the tradition of Marx and Engels in his elaboration of some aspects of historical materialism, such as the problem of the essence of ideologies, their correlation and role in the history of society, the question of the role played in history by the masses and individuals, questions of social psychology, some points of the history and criticism of religions, questions of art, aesthetics, and so on. With respect to historical materialism Plekhanov concerned himself above all with

* G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophic Works*, in five volumes, Vol. 3, p. 445 (in Russian).

** G. Plekhanov, *Philosophic Heritage*, in five volumes, Moscow, 1934-38, Vol. 4, p. 207 (in Russian).

ideologies—with their origin and development and their influence on the economic, social and political life of society and man. Following in Engels' footsteps, Plekhanov sought to investigate these problems, for "to explain from our mat[erialist] point of view the development of art, religion, philosophy and oth[er] ideologies is to establish fresh and persuasive proof of mat[erialism] as it is applicable to history. And that is most important".* In carrying on research into the vast history of diverse ideologies Plekhanov at the same time took issue with different idealist conceptions of history, on the one hand, and the vulgarisers and propagators of "economic materialism" on the other.

In the 1880s and 1890s, Plekhanov and the Emancipation of Labour group led by him went out of their way to start working with the labour movement in Russia proclaiming that it and scientific socialism should advance hand in hand. But the failing of Plekhanov—the pioneer of Marxism in Russia—was that he was unable to develop the revolutionary Marxist doctrine in connection with the new epoch—the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. This also accounted in part for Plekhanov's political fall after 1903. After he had committed a series of ideological, political and tactical errors, Plekhanov became a Menshevik and then a social-chauvinist and opponent of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

Nevertheless, Lenin made it clear that Plekhanov had rendered immense service in the past and written many outstanding works, especially those against the opportunists, Machists and Narodniks. Plekhanov's works written in the period 1883-1903, when he was a revolutionary Marxist, furthered the traditions of Marx and Engels and were a valuable achievement of Marxist thought. Even in 1906, when Plekhanov was already a Menshevik, Lenin wrote that it was impermissible to confuse Plekhanov's tactical opportunism with his theoretical works criticising Narodnik populism and opportunism, as these works were part of the Russian Social-Democrats' lasting heritage. In his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", with refe-

* G. Plekhanov, *Philosophic Heritage*, in five volumes, Vol 3, p. 90 (in Russian)

rence to the deep-rooted materialist tradition in Russia. Lenin mentions Plekhanov right after Chernyshevsky. Later, when summing up the results of Plekhanov's theoretical work and his role in carrying forward and upholding the traditions of Marx and Engels Lenin wrote in 1921: "...you *cannot* hope to become a *real*, intelligent Communist without making a study—and I mean *study*—of all of Plekhanov's philosophical writings, because nothing better has been written on Marxism anywhere in the world."^{*}

Lenin's approach to Plekhanov's philosophical works contains an important lesson still most relevant for today, namely that in serious analysis of a philosopher's views it is vital first of all to establish their sources and implications, the objects they pursue and the interests they ultimately serve.

* * *

Dialectical and historical materialism which arose as a continuation of forward-looking trends in science (including philosophy) and social thought has inherited from them a number of progressive traditions. Among these traditions preceding the emergence of Marxism the following were particularly prominent: the traditions of conscious and militant, albeit not yet consistent, materialism which at that period did not yet extend to the history of society; a dialectical approach to the cognition of reality which manifested itself in particular in classical German philosophy but was in sharp contradiction to the idealist philosophical systems within which it took shape; the humanist and democratic traditions of social thought directed at emancipating the individual from feudal, monarchical, religious and national oppression: spontaneously materialist and spontaneously dialectical traditions in science and its alliance with progressive philosophy; anti-clericalism, atheism and free-thinking; realism in literature and art associated with progressive trends in philosophy; the critical traditions of socialist theories which had not yet reached the level of scientific socialism but which actively opposed capitalism

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 32, p. 94.

and all its institutions; continuity of the development of ideas, concepts and the "conceptual material" of philosophy handed down from generation to generation.

The philosophy of Marx and Engels did not, however, confine itself to this legacy, and in the fifty years of its existence in the nineteenth century it engendered and developed fresh philosophical traditions intimately associated with the socialist movement of the revolutionary proletariat and its ideology.

The traditions of Marxist philosophy, carried forward by the followers of Marx and Engels in the nineteenth century, were carried forward to a higher stage in the twentieth century by Lenin and Leninism, providing the theoretical foundation for the activities of millions of Communists and fighters for socialism. "We preserve as a great achievement of social thinking all the knowledge about society and the class struggle, about the laws of historical development, about the socialist revolution and ways of building socialism which Marx, Engels and Lenin had given us," Leonid Brezhnev states. "We preserve them not as an archivist keeps old documents, but in a way befitting the heirs of this great teaching, boldly employing this priceless capital of knowledge in practice and constantly developing and multiplying the great theoretical wealth that has been handed down to us. Without developing Marxism-Leninism there is no moving forward for us."^{*}

* L. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 69-70

CHAPTER III

LENINIST STAGE IN THE HISTORY OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY. ITS TRADITIONS AND PROBLEMS IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Lenin wrote that in social science one is not to forget underlying historical connections, to "examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today".^{*} This statement is most relevant to the history of Marxist philosophy including its Leninist stage. At the close of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century the struggle carried on by revolutionary Marxism assumed a new character and forms. While Marxism continued to oppose bourgeois ideology, at the same time it also opposed opportunism and revisionism within the socialist working-class movement. "The dialectics of history were such," Lenin wrote, "that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists. Liberalism, rotten within, tried to revive itself in the form of socialist *opportunism*."^{**} In this situation the bourgeois and revisionist "critics" of Marxism ostensibly started calling for its "renovation". What did these "renovators" of Marxism accomplish? "*Absolutely nothing*," wrote Lenin. "Not by a single step have they advanced the science which Marx and Engels enjoined us to develop."^{***}

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p. 473.

** Ibid., Vol 18, p. 584.

*** Ibid., Vol 4, p. 211.

With prophetic insight Lenin predicted that "the ideological struggle waged by revolutionary Marxism against revisionism at the end of the nineteenth century is but the prelude to the great revolutionary battles of the proletariat, which is marching forward to the complete victory of its cause despite all the waverings and weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie".

It was on the threshold of these great revolutionary battles, on the eve of the first Russian revolution, when capitalism was entering its imperialist stage at the turn of the century that Leninism, a new stage in the history of Marxism, emerged and began to develop, and the Leninist stage in the development of the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism was ushered in.

1. THE LENINIST STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARXISM

The emergence and development of Leninism was connected with the formation and activities of the Marxist party of a new type which Lenin founded in Russia, with the advent of Bolshevism, which "*has created the ideological and tactical foundations of a Third International, of a really proletarian and Communist International, which will take into consideration both the gains of the tranquil epoch and the experience of the epoch of revolutions, which has begun*".**

The concept of Leninism, of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism, embraces not only the past but also the present and future of Marxism, its progress towards the final victory of communism and its scientific-theoretical thought on a world scale.

The CPSU Central Committee Theses "On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin" stress that "Lenin's work, his teaching, exerted a powerful influence on the Russian and international liberation movement, imparting to it principled revolutionary direction and organisation. . . .

"Lenin was a great scientist in revolution and a revolutionary in science who opened a new chapter in the devel-

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 15, p. 39.

Ibid, Vol 28, p. 292.

opment of Marxist theory and enriched all the component parts of Marxism—philosophy, political economy and scientific communism.”*

Leninism as a new stage in the history of Marxist theory and practice, the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy, have never been purely scientific, academic subjects, but always objects of acute ideological, theoretical and political struggle.

The struggle waged by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement for a correct, scientific understanding of Leninism, against its avowed and hidden enemies who distorted the essence of Leninism and of its theoretical and social role began as early as the twenties. The Mensheviks, Kautskyites and other Second International opportunists falsely depicted Leninism as a “subjectivist”, “Blanquist” political doctrine embraced by the Bolsheviks, which allegedly ran counter to the “rational” essence of Marxism and deviated from the philosophical principles of Marx’s doctrine. The Trotskyites and Zinovievites distorted Leninism, falsely describing it as nothing but a Russian brand of Marxism adopted in the conditions of a backward agrarian country. Bukharin described Leninism as no more than a “complete return to Marxism”, ignoring the dialectics of Lenin’s teaching and his creative method for developing Marxism in the conditions of a new epoch.

Many theoretical works published in the twenties in the Soviet Union and abroad treated Lenin merely as a political thinker and leader who had revived the revolutionary principles of Marxism that had been forgotten and “walled up” by the Second International, putting them into practice in the conditions of the socialist revolution in Russia; but they did not pay sufficient attention to Lenin’s creative development of Marxist theory, including philosophy, with reference to the new historical epoch and the experience of the international communist movement in the twentieth century.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist parties made a stand against these er-

* *On the Centenary of the Birth of U I Lenin*, Moscow, pp. 5, 6, 7

aneous ideas on the essence of Leninism. Many prominent Soviet Marxists—M. Kalinin, S. Kirov, N. Krupskaya, V. Kuibyshev, A. Lunacharsky, D. Manuilsky, V. Nevsky, M. Olminsky, J. Stalin, P. Stuchka, M. Frunze, Y. Yaroslavsky and other CPSU leaders published works elucidating various aspects of Leninism and indicating the great contribution it had made to revolutionary theory. Works by Marxist philosophers (V. Adoratsky, V. Bystryansky, S. Ganovskiy, F. Gorokhov, H. Duncker, M. Mitin, P. Yudin, F. Konstantinov, M. Kammari, I. Luppel, T. Pavlov, A. Troitsky, B. Chagin, A. Shcheglov and others) published at the end of the twenties and during the thirties expounded the essence of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy and the significance of its various aspects.

Modern critics of Marxism-Leninism groundlessly assert that the term, "Leninism", was "invented" by Stalin as a "cover" for his own views and actions, so that he should be able to come forward with his own interpretation of Marxism different from Lenin's.*

The history of the world communist movement and its theoretical studies disproves these and similar fabrications. In fact, the concept of Leninism derives from the concept

* Distorted conceptions of the history of Leninism sometimes find their way into writings published in some socialist countries. Muhamed Filipović, a Yugoslav philosopher, maintains in his *Lenin. A Monograph on his Doctrine* that the concept of Leninism was introduced in 1924 by Stalin, and that it was not since the end of the 19th century but "since that time" (1924) that "a certain distinctive period started in the history of the Soviet revolution and Russian and world Marxism". Following in Trotsky's footsteps and joining with the renegade Max Lange and reactionary bourgeois Marxologists Joseph Bocheński, Gerhart Niemeyer and Gustav Wetter, Muhamed Filipović misrepresents the development of Leninism in the world communist movement after 1924 as "Stalinism" and a "Stalinist interpretation of Marxism", as "extending the significance of Leninism from a Russian plane onto a world plane", reducing Leninism to little more than a matter of strategy and tactics.

Filipović resurrects and extols Trotsky's utterly false representation of two phases in the history of Leninism, alleging that the first of these—prior to 1917—was a phase of "sectarianism and political disputes in émigré circles", while during the second, after 1917, Lenin allegedly renounced his former views on the revolution in Russia—all of which has no factual foundation.

of Bolshevism, introduced by Lenin in 1903. The concept of Leninism, which became current in literature and Party life in the first half of the twenties, was evolved in the course of the Party's collective theoretical research when Lenin was still alive, and was set down in the resolutions of the 13th Party Conference. The conference resolutions supported the initiative of the major proletarian organisations which had launched the study of Leninism. The resolutions of the 13th Party Congress (1924) stated that it was necessary to introduce Leninism in the teaching of social sciences, to study thoroughly Lenin's contribution to the development of revolutionary theory and practice, to study in detail and publish Lenin's theoretical works.

Thanks to the joint efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement, a profound and correct conception of Leninism as the Marxism of the new historical epoch, of the Leninist stage in Marxism, as the continuation and creative development of Marxism not only in practice but also with respect to every part of its theory, was formulated as early as the twenties. The unshakable conviction that Leninism is an international doctrine, the theoretical and ideological foundation of the world communist movement of the current epoch, won the day.

Relevant in this context is the question of Stalin's definition (1924) of Leninism as the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. This definition played a major constructive role in combatting Second International social-democratism, Trotskyism and other anti-Leninist views that rejected or distorted Leninism. It was, basically, a correct definition, for it viewed Leninism as a continuation of Marxism in the conditions of the new epoch, as a doctrine of an international character, applicable not to Russia alone but to the international working-class movement as well, and considered Leninism not only from a practical aspect, as a factor in revolutionary action, but also from a theoretical aspect, as a continuation and development of all the component parts of the Marxist doctrine. Yet this definition was incomplete as it failed to view the object (Leninism in the present instance) in its development and from every aspect. After all, by that time, the beginning of

1924, a socialist social system had been under construction for over six years in the USSR and a struggle had been going on between the imperialist system and socialism which was gaining the upper hand in the USSR. The building of socialism in the USSR was inspiring the proletarian, national liberation and democratic movements of our epoch. Consequently this epoch was no longer—as it had been before October 1917—an epoch of the unlimited domination of imperialism, of its omnipotence, for after the victorious socialist revolution in Russia imperialism began to crumble.

Stalin, while providing a definition of Leninism and its theoretical essence that has been of great significance to the ideological substantiation of the contemporary communist movement and of the struggle against the adversaries and distorters of Leninism, failed, however, to disclose with adequate consistency certain aspects of Leninism. First, in his works of the 1920s and 1930s on Leninist method Stalin dwelt for the most part on political strategy and tactics but without treating either fully or deeply enough the theoretical and philosophical essence of dialectical materialism elaborated by Lenin, the universal scientific philosophical method of materialist dialectics; he did not bring out its complete incompatibility with the dogmatism, vulgar evolutionism and sophistry of the bourgeois and social-reformist theories of the 20th century which Lenin had opposed.

Second, in discussing Lenin's philosophical and theoretical legacy Stalin commented upon such classical works by Lenin as *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and *The State and Revolution* but did not consider Lenin's works as a whole. He did not consider, for instance, the works written after the October Revolution, in which Lenin elaborated and elevated to a still higher stage the scientific philosophical, critical revolutionary, dialectical Marxist method. Admittedly, in 1924 Stalin was not yet aware of the existence of Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks*, yet, in his later works, including his brochure *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, when describing the philosophical theory and method of Leninism, he failed to attach due significance to the fresh contribution to materialist dialectics that Lenin made in the *Philosophical Notebooks*.

Third, in his theoretical works Stalin confined himself mainly to the theoretical and political experience of the Bolshevik Party, that was of particular importance since the party created by Lenin was a model to other Marxist parties of a new type. However, Stalin did not point out the full impact of the influence exerted by Lenin's party on other Communist parties, nor did he unfold the significance of the struggle waged by other Communist parties for Leninism and its creative development. This fact was subsequently seized upon by the enemies and "critics" of Leninism who, making much of Stalin's insufficient attention to the theoretical and ideological experience of other Communist Parties manifested in his works, were misguided enough to interpret Leninism as a purely Russian or "limited" Soviet phenomenon, cast doubt on the international character of Leninism and contrast it with modern, so-called Western, Marxism.

After World War II, with the emergence of a world socialist system and collapse of the imperialist colonial system, it became clear that the essentially correct definition of Leninism put forward by Stalin in 1924 was incomplete and failed to cover all aspects of the problem. The need was felt for a more comprehensive, all-round definition of Leninism which would take into account the changes that had taken place in the world. Party theoreticians in the course of their collective research formulated a more comprehensive and precise definition of Leninism.

A more precise and up-to-date definition of Leninism and its historic role was provided in the CPSU Central Committee resolution on the Lenin Centenary, the address of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties on the Lenin Centenary and the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee on the Lenin Centenary issued on the same occasion. The Central Committee Theses state: "Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the epoch of the collapse of colonialism and the victory of national-liberation movements, the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism and the building of communist society."* The Theses

* *On the Centenary of the Birth of U. I. Lenin*, Moscow, p. 5.

point out that Leninism is a great international doctrine, a methodology of revolutionary thought and action for all genuine revolutionaries. These definitions reveal the characteristic features of Lenin's doctrine which have been developing throughout the history of Marxism ever since the end of the nineteenth century and up until the present.

Contemporary Marxist writers often maintain that, chronologically speaking, Leninism is the Marxism of two historical epochs: it is, first, the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism (which began to collapse not at the end of the nineteenth century but only after October 1917) and proletarian revolutions and, second, it is also the Marxism of the new historical epoch which started with the victorious October Revolution, when imperialism and its colonial system began to collapse as a result of victorious socialist and national liberation revolutions and when the struggle broke out between two social systems—the decaying capitalist system and the growing socialist system. It is supposed that this definition of Leninism may be extended in the future, and when the capitalist world system has been abolished and the whole world has embarked on a road of socialist development, the doctrine and method of Leninism will furnish a theoretical and ideological foundation for the communist world outlook embraced by the whole of mankind.

Another problem discussed in Marxist literature at present is whether all that has been said in the sphere of philosophy, theory and social thought by everyone who belonged or belongs to the communist movement in the 20th century is relevant to Leninism. It is quite obvious, for example, that it is impossible to ascribe to Leninism, or include in it offshoots of the personality cult, still less Right-opportunist, Left-sectarian and other revisionist views quite alien to Leninism held by some Communist Party members who claim that they share the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism but who abandon its principles, although formally many of them recognise Leninism and embarked on their political activities during the period when Leninism was developing apace. Neither can trends of theoretical and social thought in the working-class and national liberation movements, in the Communist and Workers' parties, which

are either immature and limited interpretations of Marxism or unintentional—and sometimes deliberate—distortions of Marxism, be linked with Leninism.

Nevertheless, the existence of such views, alien to Leninism, and sometimes even anti-Leninist, within the labour and national liberation movements does not mean that the history of revolutionary Marxism in the 20th century should not be considered a Leninist stage in the history of Marxism. When we say "the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism", including philosophy, we mean the period of the history of Marxism that began at the turn of the century when, in the new historical epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, and later in the new historical epoch after the October Revolution, the theory and practice of Marxism developed further on the basis of its revolutionary principles, in the struggle against the opportunist trends from the Right and "Left" within the working-class movement. In this period Marxism-Leninism has been the ideological banner of the international communist movement. The Leninist period in the development of Marxism, which started at the end of the nineteenth century and already comprises seven decades of the twentieth is a period when Leninism has become the main trend in the development of Marxism, the trend which the revolutionary labour movement in Russia began to follow early in the twentieth century and which the international communist movement has also been following ever since the October Revolution of 1917.

Unlike other currents of thought in the working-class movement of the twentieth century which are labelled Marxist (e.g., Social-Democratic, Trotskyite, anarcho-syndicalist, Maoist and other "national-communist" movements), Leninism is characterised by its uncompromising attitude towards bourgeois ideology and opportunism both on the Right and "Left". The Leninists uphold the purity and creative development of Marxist theory, organically combine their theoretical work with revolutionary practice, consistently pursue and develop the principles of proletarian internationalism, implement the principle of commitment in ideology and proceed from the philosophical principles of dialectical and historical materialism.

A general description of Lenin's vast and diverse contribution to the development of Marxist philosophy is given in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee issued on the occasion of the recent Lenin centenary. It runs: "Lenin's further elaboration of materialistic dialectics, his study of the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge and his idea of the union of natural science with philosophy are of everlasting importance. Lenin was the first thinker of our century who saw in the achievements of natural science of his time the beginning of a tremendous scientific revolution, who was able to disclose and generalise philosophically the revolutionary meaning of the fundamental discoveries made by the great explorers of nature. He gave a brilliant philosophical interpretation of new scientific data in the period of the drastic 'breaking of principles' in the leading fields of natural science. His idea of the inexhaustibility of matter has become the general principle of natural science.

"Lenin comprehensively studied the dialectics of social development, the interaction of economics and politics, the interconnection of social being and social consciousness, and many other questions. The elaboration of the problems of social development by Lenin was closely connected with the requirements of revolutionary practice and ideological struggle. Lenin's criticism of subjectivism in philosophy and sociology dealt a crucial blow at the ideological sources of political voluntarism and adventurism. His criticism of the concepts of fatalism and spontaneity as the theoretical basis of the tactics of Right-wing opportunism were of fundamental importance."*

It would be wrong to think that only Lenin's own works constitute Leninism, while the works of his comrades and followers, are not part of it. Similarly, it would be wrong to believe that the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism ended with Lenin's death in 1924, and all subsequent theoretical work of the CPSU, other Marxist-Leninist parties, the Comintern and contemporary Marxists belongs to a "post-Leninist stage" of Marxism.

Lenin's thought was never the result of the work of a solitary genius of the revolution or that of a handful of

* *On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin*, Moscow, p. 15

academics or revolutionaries. As the Marxist party grew, first of all a nucleus of professional revolutionaries, both theoreticians and politicians, took shape and then, after the victorious proletarian revolution, the number of theoreticians in the Party and socialist government grew apace.

Whereas prior to the October Revolution Marxist-Leninist theory had advanced mainly thanks to the efforts of the Bolshevik Party, founded and led by Lenin, in the new, post-October period Marxist-Leninist theory was developed not only by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but also by other Communist and Workers' parties founded on the revolutionary principles of Leninism to which they remained unswervingly loyal.

At no point in time has it been historically necessary to pass over from the Leninist stage of development of Marxism to any "post-Leninist stage", for the principles of Leninism, its theory and method, have been demonstrating their force and vitality throughout the current epoch, providing the necessary base for the development of the theoretical and political work of Marxist-Leninist parties and for the development of the political, strategic and tactical principles of the parties loyal to Leninism. Continuity is inherent in all stages of the historical development of Leninism, both during Lenin's lifetime and since his death. Admittedly, some Communist parties deviated from certain precepts of Marxist doctrine and Leninist norms of Party life, as for example during the period of the personality cult; some Communist parties called in question the theoretical, ideological or political principles of Leninism adopted by the international communist movement and deviated from certain principles and traditions of Leninism. However, such deviations and departures from Leninist principles, theoretical tenets and norms of Party life are by no means of a general, universal character.

While carrying forward the principles and ideas of Marxism, Leninism never stands still content with results already achieved but advances irresistibly. Its stages largely correspond to major periods in the history of the Russian and international communist movements—the periods of the preparation, implementation and development of the socialist revolution.

The first historical stage in the development of Leninism coincides approximately with the quarter of a century preceding the October Revolution (1894-1917). At this stage Marxist doctrine was applied to the analysis of the development of capitalism in Russia which, at the turn of the century, had become the centre of the revolutionary movement in Europe; and problems connected with the implementation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its further evolution into socialist revolution were elaborated theoretically. Marxist analysis of the imperialist epoch and the elaboration and substantiation of a new theory of socialist revolution and of the Marxist party of a new type whose policy, strategy and tactics differed fundamentally from those of the Social-Democratic parties of the Second International, also relate to that period.

The fact that before the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 Lenin had concentrated mainly on providing a theoretical substantiation for the revolution in Russia in no way detracted from the international significance of his creative Marxist thought. Lenin was quite right when, early in the twentieth century, at the very dawn of the labour movement, he wrote: "History has now confronted us with an immediate task which is the *most revolutionary* of all the *immediate* tasks confronting the proletariat of any country. The fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but . . . of Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat."*

Lenin's prediction was borne out in October 1917. The theoretical preparation for the victorious proletarian revolution in Russia which made the Russian working class the vanguard of the international proletariat had been provided in Lenin's immortal works and ideas, and, above all, in his new theory of socialist revolution.

The second stage in the history of Leninism, in the progress of its theoretical achievement covered a period of twenty years immediately after the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution, in which the transition from capitalism to socialism took place in the USSR and in which Com-

* V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 373.

communist parties emerged and developed in many countries during the general crisis of capitalism between the First and Second World wars. The main lines along which Marxist thought developed in that period were: scientific substantiation of the character, content and objective laws of the new historical epoch, of the methods and objective laws of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and of the development of the world revolutionary process; exposure of the ideology and policies of imperialist reaction, and fascism in particular; and the struggle against social-reformist, Trotskyite, Right-wing opportunist and other anti-Leninist concepts, for the triumph of Leninism in the ideology and policies of the labour movement and the revolutionary movement as a whole.

The creative development of Marxist theory found expression in Lenin's works written in 1917-23, in the works of Lenin's associates, the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and in CPSU and Comintern policy and other major documents.

A notable contribution to the struggle for Leninism in the international communist movement at that time was made by William Gallacher and Harry Pollitt (Britain), Georgi Dimitrov and Vasil Kolarov (Bulgaria), Béla Kun (Hungary), Ho Chi Minh (Vietnam), Ernst Thälmann, Klara Zetkin and Wilhelm Pieck (Germany), Jose Dias (Spain), Antonio Gramsci and Palmiro Togliatti (Italy), Li Ta-chao and Chu Chiu-po (China), Yu. Marchlewski and Yu. Lenski (Poland), William Foster (USA), Otto Kuusinen (Finland), Marcel Cachin and Maurice Thorez (France), Klement Gottwald (Czechoslovakia), Sen Katayama (Japan) and other Communist leaders and writers.

Prominent leaders of the world communist movement pointed out time and again the effective international role played by Marxism-Leninism and the ever-growing significance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as the basis of the scientific world outlook shared by progressive forces everywhere. Palmiro Togliatti wrote that the Communists' ideology, "Marxism, has emerged as a result of the development of scientific thought over a number of centuries, development to which the best minds of the human race have contributed. . . . It is the most realistic of all philosoph-

real doctrines that have ever existed, containing a detailed exposure of every kind of obscurantism, of vain idealist fancy and departure from reality. Marxism rejects all dogmatism and is capable of grasping any new development expressive of the irresistible tendency for progress... It is the sole doctrine which helps men to achieve self-knowledge and become masters of their destiny and the world, because it defines men's activities with the utmost clarity, directing their steps towards objectives such as were perfectly feasible and realistic at each given moment of history". The founder of the Italian Communist Party, Antonio Gramsci, wrote that "Lenin has indeed furthered the advance of philosophy as far as he had furthered the advance of political doctrine and practice".*

Prominent Communist Party leaders abroad have often pointed out the relevance and vital significance of Leninism, of its philosophy, for the communist movement today. Gus Hall, General Secretary of the US Communist Party writes: "This science, this body of thought is now correctly referred to as Marxism-Leninism, because through analysis and selection it has absorbed the central human experience since the passing of Karl Marx. As a science, it has further grown and developed. As a body of thought, it has rejected the 'weeds', has pruned the false 'offshoots', and has chopped off the branches that attached themselves to it. Because of this Marxism-Leninism has become mankind's most meaningful extension in the field of thought. It is mankind's most effective tool with which to probe, and so to change that which it probes."**

The new, third period of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism stretches from the mid-thirties to the end of the fifties and is characterised by a struggle for the complete and final triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union, by the victory won by the Soviet people and other freedom-loving peoples over fascism in World War II, by the breaking away of a number of European and Asian countries

* Antonio Gramsci, *Il materialismo storico e la filosofia di Benedetto Croce*, 1949, p. 39

** Gus Hall, "For World Communist Unity", *World Marxist Review*, May 1968, Vol. 11, No. 5, p. 32.

from the imperialist system and the emergence and development of the world community of socialist nations. Erroneous attempts are often made to present that period in the history of the communist movement up until the early fifties as "Stalinism", the "cult of Stalin and his ideology", and so forth. This constitutes a departure from the scientific Marxist approach to social and ideological or theoretical processes which, contrary to historical fact, are regarded as contingent solely upon the will, views and actions of some particular political leader (Stalin in the present instance); or they are regarded from a one-sided, negative point of view as an offshoot of "social deformations", etc., that have allegedly sprung up in the communist movement and socialist society. As the Soviet press has repeatedly pointed out, the Stalin cult, condemned on the initiative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and finally uprooted following the decisions of the 20th CPSU Congress (1956), amounted to a departure from the democratic Leninist norms of Party life and certain traditions of Leninism and the Leninist method. In some cases, this cult held back the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theoretical thought and did serious harm to the cause of socialism, undermining the international prestige of communism. But, as justly pointed out in the CC CPSU decision "On Overcoming the Personality Cult and Its Consequences", adopted in June, 1956, the personality cult could not alter the nature of the socialist social and political system, the ideology of Soviet society and the international communist movement. "The belief that any individual, even of Stalin's magnitude, can change our social and political system," the Decision states, "is deeply contrary to the facts, to Marxism, to the truth, and represents a relapse into idealism. That view would ascribe to individuals such extraordinary and superhuman powers as ability to change the structure of a society, and moreover of a society in which the millions of working people are the decisive force."*

Notwithstanding the limitations the personality cult imposed on the development of Marxist theory and certain in-

* *On Overcoming the Personality Cult and Its Consequences* Decision of the CC CPSU, Moscow, 1956, p. 18.

congruous practices it engendered, Marxist thought in the CPSU and world communist movement proceeded along the path of Leninism, developing on the basis of its revolutionary principles. Marxist-Leninist theory was substantiated and enriched by the experience of the construction and development of socialist society in the Soviet Union and later on by the experience of other countries embarking on the socialist path, as well as by the revolutionary practice of Communist and Workers' parties and the historical experience of their struggle against imperialist reaction and fascism.

In that period, Soviet and other Marxists, who proceeded from the principles of Leninism, subjected to theoretical analysis the nature and results of World War II, the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism which set in after the war, the changes to be observed in the world revolutionary process, the disintegration of the imperialist colonial system and the formation and development of the world socialist system. Marxists in the Soviet Union and other countries published a number of works exposing fascism, racialism and reactionary nationalism, militarism and other developments in imperialist ideology and policies. A number of Marxist works appeared which started to study and synthesise the latest achievements of science and technology at that time.

Thus, at this stage of its history as well, Leninism advanced, developing its principles, absorbing fresh experience and winning millions of new supporters, and we have no scientific and theoretical—not to mention socio-historical—reasons for believing that Leninism was supplanted at that time by "Stalinism", that it stopped moving forward, became "twisted", began to "stagnate", and so forth, as bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists, and some misguided Marxists too, would have us believe.

The new stage in the history of the CPSU and world communist movement started in the late fifties when the construction of socialism was completed and the construction of a communist society was launched in the Soviet Union and when the world communist movement began to develop in a situation of the next (third) stage of the general crisis of capitalism. In this period a notable contribution to the

development of Marxist-Leninist theory was made in the decisions and other documents adopted by CPSU congresses and some Central Committee plenums in the documents of the 1957, 1960 and 1969 International Communist Party Meetings, and in works by Soviet and other Marxist writers.

The development of Leninism in the current period proceeds mainly by way of analysis of our epoch from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of its contradictions and their solution; analysis of the world revolutionary process and its diverse trends. Leninism also studies the objective laws and paths of the development of the world socialist system and the roads and objective laws of the development of the communist formation and its transition from its lower to its higher phase. Marxist studies of social forecasting and planning, of the experience accumulated in countries which have broken off with past traditions and are following the socialist path or embarking on the non-capitalist road, are playing a steadily increasing role. Marxist-Leninist theory, which is developing along these and some other important lines in a struggle against bourgeois ideology and Right-wing and "Left" revisionism, is being enriched at the current stage of its history by hundreds of works by Soviet and foreign Marxists loyal to the principles of Leninism in their investigations of modern problems.

Thus, the history of Leninism at different stages of its development shows that the unity of scientific theory and revolutionary practice has always been, and continues to be, a constant feature of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The contribution made by Lenin and the Leninists to the Marxist concept of the unity of theory and practice consists, above all, in advanced revolutionary theory, which, unlike Second International dogmas, is regarded as a guide to action and is based on a creative approach to new phenomena appearing in social life and science, as well as on scientific foreknowledge of what course history will take. Opportunist precipitancy, narrow empiricism and pragmatism which lead to underestimation of the role of theory, declaring it to be a mere appendage of practice, are utterly alien to Leninism. Neither has Leninism anything to do with scholastic severance of theory from practice and philosophy from social life and science, or with pedantry and dogmatism. Leninism,

which starts out from the socio-historical practice of the revolutionary proletariat rising up to implement a socialist revolution and build a new society in ways hitherto unknown, provides the theoretical substantiation for the programme, strategy, tactics and policy of Marxist parties of a new type, of which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, founded by Lenin, was the first.

Leninism has covered a long road that was difficult and complex, rich in struggle and creative achievement. The creative development of Marxism-Leninism is no smooth process. At every new historical stage of the revolutionary labour movement, it has to surmount diverse opportunist tendencies. The international character and creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, including philosophical theory, have often been attacked before and continue to be attacked now both by Right-wing revisionist "neo-Marxists" or "Young Marxists", as the father of "neo-Marxism", J. Bocheński, prefers to call them) and by "Left"-wing revisionists, petty-bourgeois sectarian and adventurist elements. Lenin laid bare the causes of petty-bourgeois waverings in Communist and Workers' parties in his *Differences in the European Labour Movement*, *"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder* and many other works. He stressed that "the enlistment of larger and larger numbers of new 'recruits', the attraction of new sections of the working people must inevitably be accompanied by waverings in the sphere of theory and tactics by repetitions of old mistakes, by a temporary reversion to antiquated views and antiquated methods, and so forth".*

Leninism was opposed by the Mensheviks and other Second International opportunists who falsely accused Lenin of subjectivism and Machism, alleging that he was indifferent to philosophy, that his views were philosophically unfounded, and so forth. Lenin was also opposed by "Left"-wing revisionists, such as the "empirio-monists", the God-builders and other apostates from Marxism among Russian Social Democrats, who vociferously accused him of dogmatism, fatalism, reversion to metaphysical materialism, and so on.

* V I Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 348.

The social-reformists of the Second International, Trotskyites, the followers of Bukharin and Zinovyev, bourgeois nationalist elements, who confined Leninism strictly to backward agrarian Russia, sought to put forward their own "models" of social development in the place of Leninism, and sundry eclectic concepts in the place of dialectical materialism. Many of these opponents, "critics" and "innovators" of Marxism-Leninism, have long since been repudiated by history. Their anti-Marxist concepts have been exposed and surmounted in the course of the consistent ideological and political struggle to uphold Leninism in the world communist movement, and most of them are no longer even remembered.

Leninism has stood the test of the time, rebuffed all attacks on revolutionary Marxist teaching. Over some eighty years that it has been in existence, Leninism has demonstrated its staying power, vitality and creative capacity in every sphere of revolutionary practice and theory. After the October Revolution of 1917 Leninism became the international banner of theory and revolutionary action for Communists the world over providing the scientific methodology for the policy, strategy and tactics of Communist parties in numerous countries, and it has developed into the most potent ideological and political forces of the present day.

2. CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE LENINIST STAGE IN THE HISTORY OF MARXIST PHILOSOPHY. LENIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

The Leninist stage in the history of Marxist philosophy is a major and integral part of the creative development of Marxism between the end of the nineteenth century and the present.

The essence of the Leninist stage in the history of Marxist philosophy consists in the all-round development of the principles, ideas and concepts of dialectical and historical materialism under the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and during the new historical epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to communism. The Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy is a new, higher

stage in the development of dialectical and historical materialism linked up with rapidly rising creative activity, both intellectual and practical, of the working class and the masses engaged in the communist transformation of society, with fresh achievements in natural science, technology and the social sciences, and with new range and forms of the struggle against contemporary bourgeois philosophical revisionism from Right and "Left".

Leninism enriches, develops and applies Marx's dialectics to new socio-historical conditions, thereby implementing the revolutionary-theoretical mission of Marxism about which Lenin wrote: "The whole theory of Marx is the application of the theory of development—in its most consistent, complete, considered and pithy form—to modern capitalism. Naturally, Marx was faced with the problem of applying this theory both to the *forthcoming* collapse of capitalism and to the *future* development of *future* communism.... Marx treated the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of, say, a new biological variety, once he knew that it had originated in such and such a way and was changing in such and such a definite direction."*

Lenin often pointed out that Marxists should never for a moment lose sight of the dialectically contradictory and versatile nature of historical development and proceed merely from ready-made accepted formulas and positions. By losing sight of this, Lenin reminded his fellow Marxists, "we turn Marxism into something one-sided, distorted and lifeless: we deprive it of its life blood; we undermine its basic theoretical foundations—dialectics, the doctrine of historical development, all-embracing and full of contradictions; we undermine its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch, which may change with every new turn of history".**

When the revolutionary labour movement had just come into being in Russia, at the turn of the century, Lenin provided models of dialectical analysis of concrete situations. He would not, even at that time, content himself with

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 457-58.

** Ibid., Vol. 17 p. 39

general statements on the "general character of the revolution" for all countries in which capitalism was developing, as did some Western and Russian Marxists such as Kautsky and Plekhanov. Lenin saw that what was in store for Russia was not an ordinary bourgeois revolution but a bourgeois-democratic revolution which, unlike the bourgeois revolutions in the West, would be headed by the proletariat. Lenin wrote in *A Draft Programme of Our Party*, "... in Russia we see the same *basic* processes of the development of capitalism, the same *basic* tasks for the socialists and working class; but they must not, under any circumstances, lead to our forgetting the *specific features* of Russia which must find *full expression* in the specific features of our programme."^{*}

This approach was clear in Lenin's appraisal of the first Russian revolution which he, unlike dogmatic Mensheviks, viewed as bourgeois in character and proletarian in the methods of its implementation. In his speech on the revolution of 1905, Lenin stated: "The peculiarity of the Russian revolution is that it was a *bourgeois-democratic* revolution in its social content, but a *proletarian* revolution in its methods of struggle."^{**} Lenin also used this line of approach during the initial years of Soviet government when the specific features of the socialist development of our country had to be defined in the conditions of capitalist encirclement, when the transition to the New Economic Policy was being made, and so on. In his article "On Our Revolution" written in 1923, and in some other works, Lenin discloses the concrete-historical character of the radical difference between a socialist and a bourgeois revolution, pointing to the specific issues involved in carrying out a socialist revolution and building a socialist society in a relatively backward, economically poorly developed country like tsarist Russia.

"You say," Lenin told the Mensheviks, "that civilisation is necessary for the building of socialism. Very good. But why could we not first create such prerequisites of civilisation in our country as the expulsion of the landowners and the Russian capitalists, and then start moving towards

* Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 235

** Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 238

socialism? Where, in what books, have you read that such variations of the customary historical sequence of events are impermissible or impossible?"*

Lenin showed that, unlike bourgeois revolution, socialist revolution takes place in the absence of any clearly established new forms of social relations, since socialist relations cannot take shape under capitalism which merely produces their economic prerequisites. Socialist relations in society can emerge only under proletarian dictatorship, so that, political change comes before, not after—as in bourgeois revolution—economic change.

These and many other examples of Lenin's dialectical analysis of society's development in the twentieth century, brilliant illustrations of how he applied and developed the materialist-dialectical method, carry forward the dialectical tradition of Marx and Engels, providing inspiration for all Marxist parties and new generations of Communists.

Lenin demonstrated that on the basis of dialectical materialism and its extremely close links with advanced twentieth-century natural science a scientific world picture could be produced, "a picture of how matter moves and of how 'matter thinks'".**

The analysis of the recent revolution in natural science found in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other works by Lenin is of lasting significance.

Lenin's all-embracing and profound description of recent scientific discoveries made in the twentieth century includes their philosophical interpretation from the standpoint of creative Marxism. Lenin demonstrated that all these new scientific discoveries did not refute but rather vindicated dialectical materialism giving it a new look. For the scientists Lenin charted the way out of the crisis of the philosophical principles of natural science that set in early in the 20th century. Lenin's statement, "The electron is as *inexhaustible* as the atom," made in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, has become classic.***

The exceptional role played by Lenin and Leninism in providing solutions to the philosophical problems of natural

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 480

* Ibid., Vol. 14, p. 353.

*** Ibid., p. 262

science is brought out in works by S. I. Vavilov, M. V. Keldysh, B. M. Kedrov, M. E. Omelyanovsky, P. N. Fedoseyev and other scientists.

Lenin's great service to philosophy was that he elaborated Marxist dialectics in further detail, enriched its laws and categories with new content, and dialectically synthesised the practical aspects of social development and the findings of twentieth century science. It was Lenin who demonstrated the unity of Marxist dialectics, logic and theory of knowledge and worked out the problem of the very essence of dialectics—the law of unity and conflict of opposites. It was Lenin who substantiated the tenet of dialectical materialism concerning the unity of absolute and relative truth and the dialectics of the process of cognition, in particular the role played by practice, and disclosed the interdependence and intermutation of the laws and categories of materialist dialectics.

Lenin's thesis to the effect that in the world there exists the "interdependence and the closest and indissoluble connection between *all* aspects of any phenomenon (history constantly revealing ever new aspects), a connection that provides a uniform, and universal process of motion..."^{*}, and other vital elements of the dialectical-materialist method worked out by Lenin and his followers provide a priceless methodological introduction to the sciences concerned with nature, society and thought.

Lenin saw that, although at the beginning of the twentieth century the principle of development was accepted by "all", i.e., that it was recognised both in social thought and in science, an extremely limited and narrow view of development was often taken, it being regarded mainly as a decrease or increase in that which exists, refusing to acknowledge leaps, upheavals and other fundamental changes, while the source of development—the conflict of internal contradictions—was overlooked. In contrast to the narrow-evolutionist and, in the long run, metaphysical concept of development which also became current in natural science, Lenin worked out a dialectical-materialist concept of development, the essence and core of which is the law of unity and conflict

^{*} Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 54

of opposites. Lenin's concept of development, which attaches decisive significance to the unity and conflict of opposites, to the resolution of internal contradictions through revolutionary "interruptions of gradualness", through leaps, was firmly opposed to the metaphysical concept put forward by the social-opportunists in the Second International who, in defiance of the facts, maintained that in the twentieth century social contradictions "slackened off", revolutionary "cataclysms" became unnecessary, and the period of revolutions supposedly gave way to one of "gradual development" of capitalism into socialism.

In his works written after the October Revolution in which Lenin developed the dialectical-materialist view of the life of society in the new epoch, he often spoke of the scientific cognition of leaps "from the angle of the fresh turns in world history" and of the regular character of the "modifications in the customary historical sequence" of events (e.g., in connection with the non-capitalist development of backward countries shaking off imperialist oppression and with the socialist cultural revolution). He expounded the essence of the new, non-antagonistic contradictions typical of the emergent socialist formation.

In his philosophical testament—the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism"—Lenin urged Marxist philosophers to elaborate materialistically interpreted dialectics from all aspects, and comment on it "with the help of examples of the way Marx applied dialectics, as well as of examples of dialectics in the sphere of economic and political relations, which recent history, especially modern imperialist war and revolution, provides in unusual abundance".* In the same article, Lenin demonstrated that Marxism and its dialectics found fresh confirmation every day in the arousing to action of new classes and new peoples, "i.e., the hundreds of millions of human beings who form the greater part of the world population and whose historical passivity and historical torpor have hitherto conditioned the stagnation and decay of many advanced European countries".†

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 234.
 † Ibid., p. 233.

Lenin foresaw that "world history is really moving towards the dictatorship of the proletariat but is doing so by paths that are anything but smooth, simple and straight".* Although history makes zigzags and detours, Lenin stressed that it was nevertheless forging ahead rapidly and that it "is now being independently made by millions and tens of millions of people. Capitalism has now matured for socialism".**

Soon after the Soviet state had come into being, Lenin noted that while embarking on the road of socialism "we do not claim that Marx knew or Marxists know the road of socialism down to the last detail. It would be nonsense to claim anything of the kind. What we know is the direction of this road, and the class forces that follow it; the specific, practical details will come to light only through the *experience of the millions* when they take things into their own hands".*** Lenin foresaw at the very dawn of socialist revolution in Russia that "a vast number of new problems would arise, that the whole situation would change in the course of the revolution, and that the situation would change *radically and often* in the course of revolution".****

The further elaboration of Marxist philosophy, of the dialectics of the modern epoch and problems of transition from capitalism to communism has shown how profound and penetrating Lenin's philosophical foresight was.

Lenin's great achievement lies in the fact that he developed the Marxist dialectical reflection theory. The theory of reflection in the philosophy of the new age was formulated by Holbach and other French eighteenth-century materialists. The French and other eighteenth-century materialists advanced a rational idea that man's sensations and conceptions reflect the surrounding world. But Lenin's reflection theory can by no means be reduced to a mere acknowledgement of this proposition. It carries further the dialectical-materialist teaching of Marx and Engels on knowledge and is fundamentally different from the contemplative, mechanistic theory of reflection of early pre-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 309

** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 162.

*** Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 281.

**** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 343.

Marxist materialism. This difference is, first, that, according to Marx and Lenin, man actually reflects the world in as far as he transforms it, in the process of his immediate practical activities. Lenin emphasises that "*practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge*, for it has not only the dignity of universality, but also of immediate actuality".*

Second, Lenin approaches the process of reflection from the standpoint of the principle of dialectical development, treating the reflection of the surrounding world in man's consciousness as a living, many-sided and complex process, not as a lifeless, instantaneous act of mirroring, and showing that absolute truth is composed of the totality of relative truths.

Third, according to Lenin, man reflects reality not for the sake of conformity, of adjustment to reality, but for the sake of changing the world and ridding man of all that has become obsolete and has outlived its usefulness, all that hampers social progress. Reflection is not an end in itself but a means of transforming the world in keeping with man's needs and interests; in the modern epoch, the final aim of such reflection is the revolutionary transformation of the world according to communist principles. Lenin elaborates the principle of reflection in close connection with the Marxist concept of man as creator, the concept of changing the world in the process of man's immediate practical activity.

Therefore, the assertions made by revisionist "critics" of Leninism (Roger Garaudy, Ernst Fischer, G. Petrović, Rudi Supek, etc.) to the effect that Lenin's reflection theory is a departure from dialectics and a return to the earlier metaphysical materialism of Holbach and Helvétius, that it is supposedly at odds with the dialectical principle of development, thereby leading to dogmatism, conformism, and so on, are unsound and groundless. Such assertions are refuted by the works of contemporary Marxist philosophers, Soviet and foreign, in particular by the Bulgarian philosopher Todor Pavlov.**

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 213.

** T. Pavlov, "Actual Problems of Lenin's Theory of Reflection", *Kommunist* No 5, 1968.

Assertions that the Marxist-Leninist theory of reflection has become obsolete have been refuted by modern science whose valuable new findings confirm the dialectical-materialist implications of the theory. There is, of course, no need to "cling" to any one or other of Lenin's formulations. There is no need, for instance, to repeat the metaphorical phrase to the effect that sensations "copy", "photograph" external objects. This idea is correct in principle, but the gist of Lenin's reflection theory is not that the objects of the external world are literally photographed or copied, but that such objects, which are outside man's consciousness, are reflected in man's sensations, that they can and do serve as a source of correct conceptions about the surrounding world.

Of course today, with the development of cybernetics, information theory, symbolic logic, etc., there exist some notions and concepts which do not photograph or copy external objects but are "symbols", "signs" and other forms of reflection of real processes. They are intermediate, auxiliary stages in the process of reflection and do not repudiate the thesis that the reflection of matter in the mind on the whole corresponds to the thing reflected and is not an arbitrary sign. Lenin's teaching on truth as a process, as a faithful and many-sided reflection of reality, of nature, was expressed in his metaphorical descriptions of objects being photographed or copied in our sensations, which do not yet comprise all aspects of the versatile process of man's active perception of the surrounding world. But what is important is not the letter but the essence of Lenin's reflection theory, which implies a practical, creative mastery and apprehension of the world and furnishes a forward-looking—not static or fossilised—correct and many-sided understanding of real phenomena with all their relationships and underlying regularities that cannot simply be photographed or copied but are revealed in the complicated process of thought which is rooted and corroborated in practical experience. Consequently, reflection in a Marxist-Leninist sense is a constituent of man's practical, immediate activity and at the same time provides the cognitive basis of the creative revolutionary transformation of the real world, of man's active intervention in the real world.

Hence, the arguments of those who deny the creative essence of Lenin's reflection theory and suggest that the principle of reflection should be 'supplemented' by a 'principle of creation' are wrong. Creation is an inseparable part of Lenin's theory of reflection.

Lenin's theoretical ideas did not stand still, and his philosophical views, his dialectical method were developed and perfected. Yet, his *Philosophical Notebooks*, in spite of what the "critics" of Leninism say, were not a denial of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and a departure from the principles of materialist philosophy, but rather a further elaboration of the dialectical-materialist theory of Marx and Engels, developed by Lenin in his works written before 1914 and in particular in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *Philosophical Notebooks* and other works, Lenin for the first time elaborated on the basis of Marxist principles the problem of the unity of dialectics, logic and the theory of knowledge. He demonstrated that the theory of reflection includes the dialectical development of the process of cognition and that cognition is the eternal, infinite approximation of thought to reality; reflection takes place in the eternal process of motion, of the emergence and resolution of contradictions. Lenin wrote that human concepts are not fixed but are eternally in motion, "they pass into one another, they flow into one another, otherwise they do not reflect living life".

Lenin's elaboration of the idea of the active reorganising role accorded to human consciousness, which was formulated in the brilliant precept that "man's consciousness not only reflects the objective world, but creates it" is of immense value to the Marxist theory of knowledge. This formula is not a paraphrase of Hegel's precepts, as some writers allege, for Hegel, who was an idealist, never believed that it was the objective world that was reflected in man's consciousness. Nor does it signify that Lenin shared the idea that objective reality is "created" by man's consciousness, thought, and so on. Consciousness, which equips the active individual, the subject changing nature and his

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 253.

social relations, not only reflects the objective world but can be conducive to the changing of both man's social and natural environment in the process of his immediate practical activity. This precept of the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge, when applied to the apprehension of nature and society, opens up unlimited possibilities for man's ever deeper and all-embracing penetration of the essence of phenomena.

Great strides forward have been made during the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism in the sphere of historical materialism, as well as in the elaboration of the philosophical problems of scientific communism. Lenin and Leninists developed and substantiated the major categories of historical materialism, such as the categories of the socio-economic formation, the dialectically contradictory unity of productive forces and relations of production, the concept of class and the class struggle, with reference to the conditions pertaining to the new, imperialist stage of capitalism, to the epoch of the collapse of capitalism and assertion of communism.

Lenin brought to light important objective laws of the new age, viz., the accelerated rate of historical development along with the growing revolutionary activity of broad sections of the masses; the possible modification of the general trend of historical development, in particular in some countries which are by-passing the capitalist stage; the development of international unity of the proletariat from different nations and the struggle of conflicting tendencies in relations between nations, and so on.

The all-round development of the teaching on socialist revolution and the theory of scientific communism, the foundations of which were laid down by Marx and Engels, has been a major achievement of the Leninist stage in the history of Marxism. Lenin amplified and substantiated the Marxist theory of revolution, elaborated the theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into socialist revolution and demonstrated that socialism could first triumph in a few countries or even in one country. The new theory of socialist revolution substantiated by Lenin and demonstrating that it was possible and inevitable for the imperialist system to be partially disrupted by means of a socialist rev-

olution in a few countries or even in a single country is closely bound up with Lenin's teaching on imperialism and the exacerbation of its contradictions. It rests on the philosophical doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, on its dialectics which takes a comprehensive view of the process of society's development in the 20th century, which is contradictory, uneven and spasmodic. Lenin's theory of socialist revolution is based on concrete analysis of specific situations, providing a living embodiment of Marx's revolutionary dialectics. Lenin foresaw that the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism in different historical conditions would take different forms, but the crux of this transition—the socialist revolution brought about under the leadership of the working class and leading to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat—was a general objective law governing the development of countries passing from capitalism to socialism in the present epoch.

Lenin's teaching on the modern historical epoch and the world revolutionary process of this epoch constitutes a great contribution to the revolutionary theory of Marxism, to its "social philosophy" as a whole. Lenin and his followers have disclosed the economic and social-political content of the current historical epoch as that of the collapse of imperialism, of socialist and national liberation revolutions, of the struggle between two social systems—socialism and capitalism—and the transition to communism. They have singled out the antagonistic interrelation of the two social formations—the emergent socialist formation and the obsolescent capitalist formation—in the process of social development since October 1917.

Leninism provides theoretical substantiation for the possibility of heterogeneous currents of the revolutionary movement, the proletarian-socialist, national liberation and general democratic currents, blending under the leadership of working-class Marxist parties, to form a single anti-imperialist current. Lenin teaches that the working class was, is and will continue to be the leading force of this revolutionary process and the vanguard of all the working people in their fight against imperialism and in their construction of socialism. It is to Lenin that we owe the integral doctrine of the proletarian party of a new type.

Lenin's theoretical substantiation of the struggle between the two social systems and of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social and political systems is particularly significant. Lenin predicted the simultaneous existence of the socialist and capitalist systems which can compete with each other relatively peacefully in the fields of economics, technology and science and settle international differences by peaceful means. At the same time, the socialist and capitalist systems are in a state of acute antagonism and struggle in respect of key social, political and ideological issues, which express the main contradiction of the current epoch—that between the forces of socialism led by the international working class and its progeny, the world socialist system, on the one hand, and the forces of imperialism and reaction, on the other.

It is also to Lenin that we owe the philosophical substantiation of the methods and objective laws pertaining to the construction and development of socialist society and the transition to communism. Lenin and his followers in their works and the CPSU in its documents, substantiated the scientific plan for the construction of socialism, the component parts of which are the theory of socialist industrialisation, the teaching on co-operation in agriculture, the theory of cultural revolution, the precept for eliminating the actual inequality of peoples, subjecting them to socialist transformation, bringing about their rapprochement and, above all, the proposition concerning the growth of the creative activity of the masses, the builders of socialism. "Creative activity . . . is the basic factor of the new public life," Lenin wrote. "Socialism cannot be decreed from above. Its spirit rejects the mechanical bureaucratic approach; living, creative socialism is the product of the masses themselves."^{*}

The philosophical-theoretical substantiation of the Leninist plan for socialist construction was provided by Lenin's ideas concerning the fundamental distinction between socialist and bourgeois revolutions and the qualitative distinctness of their objective laws, of the dialectical contradictions peculiar to the transition from capitalism to socialism and methods for their solution, and so on. These ideas are set

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 288

out in a number of Lenin's works written after the October Revolution, in particular in his work "Our Revolution" which outlines the specific issues involved in the development of new social relations and new culture after the socialist revolution.

At the same time, according to Lenin, there can be no question of Marxism allowing of two kinds of dialectics—"antagonistic dialectics" for capitalism and "harmonious dialectics" for socialism.

There is *one* kind of dialectics in Marxism-Leninism, and its basic principles, laws and categories are the same for different spheres of nature, society and thought and for different stages of social history, but the forms in which they manifest themselves, the type of resolution and methods required for resolving contradictions under socialism essentially differ from other social formations of an antagonistic character.

Lenin creatively elaborated the question of the role played in the life of society by the subjective factor. Opponents of Leninism often argue that while Marx started out from the principle of economic or social determinism, Lenin allegedly starts out from the principles of subjectivism and voluntarism, attributing decisive importance to human will, desires, etc

In actual fact, Lenin attached great importance to the role played by the subjective factor—the conscious activity of the masses, classes, parties and individual people—their practical experience of processes of revolutionary transformation of society into socialist and communist society. He wrote that "collective experience, the experience of millions can alone give us decisive guidance in this respect, precisely because, for our task, for the task of building socialism, the experience of the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of those upper sections which have made history up to now in feudal society and in capitalist society is insufficient".*

At the same time, Lenin always, throughout his career as a revolutionary and statesman, was a resolute opponent of subjectivism and voluntarism. He set the Party, the work-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 27, p 410.

ing class, Soviet society and the world communist movement none but feasible tasks, for the accomplishment of which the real material prerequisites either existed or were in the making. At the same time, Lenin had no use for fatalism or haphazard precipitancy. His works were aimed at making the Communist Party liberate, direct and utilise the revolutionary initiative of the working class and people in order to put into practice the real potential for effecting revolutionary changes and building socialism, inherent in objective reality, by means of the masses' own practical action. Lenin's methodology and theoretical tenets concerning the growing role of the subjective factor developed in close conjunction with profound scientific cognition of the objective laws of society's development, initially elaborated in his first major Marxist work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (1894), and later expounded in many other works.

By the turn of the century the objective prerequisites for socialist transformations had emerged in many capitalist countries, including those like Russia, in which capitalism had not yet reached an advanced level. Therefore, the question arose as to how best to set in motion the subjective factor, i.e., the revolutionary forces of social development capable of effecting socialist and consistently democratic change—the working class and peasantry, oppressed national minorities, and so on.

In his report, "Lenin's Cause Lives on and Triumphs", Leonid Brezhnev points out: "With splendid mastery of the whole arsenal of Marxist theory, a brilliant strategist and tactician, a man totally free of the slightest semblance of dogmatism, Lenin was prepared to meet any turn in historical events. He clearly saw that the imperialist world war had started a general explosion of tremendous force. From then on Lenin devoted the whole of his activity to show that the revolution was near, and to prepare it."²

Some would-be Marxist writers abroad are entirely mistaken in their groundless attempts to see in Lenin's works nothing but a methodology of historical initiative, to deny the scientific character and continued relevance of Lenin's

² L. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 257

reflection theory, and regard it as a "tribute to dogmatism" whenever the Marxist-Leninist idea that the objective laws of history are still of decisive significance today is emphasised.

Lenin's teachings on the state under proletarian dictatorship and the development of socialist democracy, which have a bearing on every component part of Marxism, constitute an immense contribution to Marxist theory. Lenin predicted in his philosophical writings that the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as a general historical tendency, would be effected in diverse ways. Leninism substantiated the dialectical idea of Marx and Engels to the effect that the development of socialist statehood would later be conducive to the withering away of the state and the evolution of such a dictatorship into communist public self-administration.

Lenin and his followers enriched Marxist philosophical doctrine with respect to the intellectual life of man and society, to the apprehension of science, literature and art, morality and justice, social psychology and human culture as a whole. Lenin discovered the objective laws and patterns discernible in the greatest change in the history of man's intellectual life, i.e., the effecting of a communist transformation of human consciousness and a socialist revolution in the sphere of ideology and culture. The revolutionary negation of old, obsolete and reactionary forms of ideology is dialectically linked in Leninist thought with the life-asserting optimistic idea that communism is to be built not by destroying and rejecting material and spiritual culture of the past but by absorbing all the wealth of knowledge and culture hitherto amassed by mankind. Communism and its culture are built through "the *development* of the best models, traditions and results of the *existing* culture, *from the point of view* of the Marxist world outlook and the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat in the period of its dictatorship".*

When furnishing theoretical substantiation of ways for ensuring rapid development of science, art and culture in the name of mankind regenerated by communism, Lenin foresaw that the time would come when "all the marvels of science

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 42, p. 217.

and the gains of culture belong to the nation as a whole, and never again will man's brain and human genius be used for oppression and exploitation".

Lenin also made many other discoveries in the sphere of historical materialism and scientific communism. The scientific definition of class, changes in class structure and forms of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat we owe to Lenin.

It was he who singled out the existence of two dialectically contradictory tendencies in the development of national relations in the modern epoch—the economic and social rapprochement of nations in the process of world economic development, sweeping away "national barriers", on the one hand, and the development of national liberation movements and consequently of national statehood, national culture, national awareness, and so on, on the other.

Lenin furnished a scientific solution for the national question in this epoch showing that it lay in the struggle to end the real economic and cultural inequality of peoples, to secure their rapprochement in socialist society, and so on.

These and many other precepts first formulated by Lenin hinge on the scientific idea, substantiated in detail by Lenin, of the growing role of the subjective factor in the life of society in the current epoch.

Lenin's teaching on the part played by the subjective factor in the revolution is diametrically opposed to diverse subjectivist and voluntaristic conceptions which ignore the objective material prerequisites of social progress, starting out from no more than the desires and aspirations of individual political leaders.

Our opponents, all kinds of critics of Leninism, sometimes find themselves obliged to admit that Lenin created the theory of socialist revolution, the doctrine of imperialism, the state and dictatorship of the proletariat. Often enough, this fact is not called in question, while Lenin's theories are still declared to be "antiquated" and allegedly in need of radical modification. But "critics" of Leninism, in defiance of historical truth, claim that Leninism is far removed from the humanist problems on which the atten-

* Ibid, Vol 26, pp. 481-82.

tion of contemporary philosophy is focussed, that it pays no heed to the individual's interests and requirements, ignoring man as an individual and concerning itself solely with masses, classes, and so on. In fact, however, Leninism, ever since it came into being, has always proceeded from the interests of the working man, from the tasks involved in the liberation of the human individual from the fetters of exploitation and oppression, and has been actively fighting for man's freedom and happiness.

Lenin often examined the question of man as an individual, how best to liberate him from the filth and abominations of earlier society, stamp out the "vestiges of the beast" in man, help everyone become a creative, cultured, well-informed and harmoniously developed individual of communist convictions. Yet, in the circumstances prevailing in his day Lenin was unable to give priority to the theoretical elaboration of the problem of man as an individual. When old social relations were being shattered, imperialist and civil wars being fought, the economic disorganisation combatted and the new socialist state launched, attention had to be turned above all to changing the character of social relations, suppressing and abolishing the exploiting classes and defending the gains of the revolution in an all-out struggle with its enemies. All this was done, nonetheless, without the problem of man being ignored, but on the contrary, with real concern for the working man, for his freedom and happiness, for the future of mankind.

Lenin's works contain much material that is devoted specifically to the problem of man, of the individual, and their general trend is of a humanist nature. Already in his first major work *What the "Friends of the People" Are...* Lenin set out to demonstrate that history is made up of the actions of real persons and that the activities of individuals result in the formation of social relations; there is much scope left for individual activity, since determinism "in no way destroys man's reason or conscience, or appraisal of his actions".*

At the same time, Lenin—just as the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels—never treated the problem of man from the point of view of "abstract humanism" but,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 159

in keeping with the Marxist principle of class struggle always applied a class approach to this problem. Man to Lenin is not merely a generic, biological individual, but an active, historically conditioned, complex social being, set apart above all by work, by his practical activity which transforms nature, society and himself. Lenin did not speak of man in general, of the individual regardless of his social position: he bore in mind first of all the working man, his activities, the formation of his personality, of his consciousness, and so on.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *Philosophical Notebooks* and other works, Lenin develops the dialectical idea that practical experience is the starting point of philosophy. Although practical experience does not create the reality of nature, it "recreates" nature and gives rise to social reality. It is precisely practical experience which determines man's attitude to the world, as expressed in his philosophy and science, that are destined to teach men how to change the world.

Consciousness, which reflects objective reality existing outside human consciousness, plays a tremendous part in men's activities; progress and improvement in the real world greatly depend on people's conscious, purposeful activity.

Thus, the relations between subject and object can be correctly apprehended only if they are approached as they exist in reality, in the process of socio-historical practice. The basis of consciousness is the regularly developing objective world which exists apart from human consciousness but is subject to the impact of human practice.

Lenin never reduced human essence to a mere complex of production relations. In his article "Karl Marx" Lenin wrote that, according to Marx, "human essence" was a "complex of all" "social relations", observing that the latter were specific, historical relations.*

Lenin viewed social man as a concrete historical complex of all social relations shaped by the development of production relations immediately associated with man's labour activities. The progress of scientific, philosophical and artistic

* Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 53.

knowledge and the enrichment of man's spiritual world, the cultivation of his intellect, emotions, ethical standards, and so on, are indispensable to the improvement and modification of human nature. It was Lenin who substantiated the idea of the all-round development of the individual which begins under socialism and comes into its own under communism.

All this refutes the fabrications of the "critics" of Leninism to the effect that there is allegedly no doctrine of man in Leninism, and that in this respect Lenin's teaching supposedly deviates from Marx's humanism, conflicting with Marx's humanist ideas, including those expressed in his early works. Assertions by some Marxist philosophers that Marxism-Leninism should evolve a new, special science—philosophical anthropology (since the problems of man have allegedly not been elaborated in the current epoch from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, and here, they claim, we have much to learn from some schools of modern bourgeois philosophy, especially from the existentialists, philosophical anthropologists, etc.) are highly controversial. The point of view expressed by the Polish philosopher A. Schaff in his *Marxism and the Human Individual* is also erroneous in this respect.

Comprehensive, scientifically-grounded criticism of the "latest" doctrines of bourgeois philosophy, reformism, revisionism and dogmatism by Lenin and his followers, constitutes a priceless contribution to the philosophy of dialectical materialism at the Leninist stage of its development. Whereas Marx and Engels criticised mainly the idealist and metaphysical theories current before the appearance of dialectical materialism, Lenin and his followers subjected to scientifically-substantiated criticism the bourgeois philosophical schools that emerged or became influential in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Lenin subjected to detailed criticism neo-Kantianism, Machism, pragmatism, "ethical socialism" and dogmatism in the Second International and many other twentieth-century bourgeois and reformist philosophical and sociological theories. Lenin also came out resolutely against dogmatic attitudes to Marxist theory.

It would, however, be wrong to believe that Lenin had

done all there is to be done, and all that remains for us to do is merely memorise and apply his precepts as they stand. Lenin furnished the starting point from which modern Marxists proceed in subjecting to critical analysis bourgeois philosophical and sociological conceptions of the current period.

Marxism-Leninism neither does nor will approach nihilistically every bourgeois philosophical or sociological doctrine as if it were nonsense or sheer reactionary propaganda engaged in whenever the ruling imperialist bourgeoisie's interests should require it. Marxism-Leninism adopts a discriminating approach to bourgeois philosophical and sociological conceptions. Some of them—including contemporary one—take up points of great interest, such as the problem of the "language of science" put forward by some positivists or the problem of the fate of the individual developed by some existentialists, in particular, Sartre, or the application of mathematical methods to research in Western empirical sociology, and so on. Nevertheless, as far as central problems—the general theoretical deductions, apprehension of the basic objective laws governing modern social development and of the tendencies of social progress, the philosophical interpretation of recent achievements of science—are concerned, none of the bourgeois philosophical and sociological schools, as twentieth-century experience has shown, can provide their correct, scientific and consistent solutions to these problems.

Marxism-Leninism is not a closed, inward-looking doctrine, it is ready to incorporate generalised conclusions that may be drawn from the findings of science and experience. Thus, we find synthesised in Marxist philosophy, for instance, the findings of cybernetics as well as those in the field of symbolic logic and other branches of scientific knowledge. Marxist-Leninist theory supports the introduction of mathematical and other precision methods into economics, sociology and other social sciences.

Marxism can incorporate in critically digested form everything there is of value in natural science, philosophical, sociological, economic and other social doctrines, that are not Marxist in character, interpreting such values as are to be found in them from the philosophical standpoint of

dialectical and historical materialism. Marxism, however, can in no way be combined with bourgeois philosophical and sociological doctrines to form some sort of common "synthetic" or "integral" doctrine or be "renovated" with the aid of such bourgeois doctrines.

Contrary to these and other attempts to garble the single and integral Marxist-Leninist teaching and distort its history, the international communist movement today places emphasis on the inseverable ties and continuity existing between all stages of development of revolutionary Marxist theory. It follows the road charted by the Marxism of the present epoch—Leninism, the living and inexhaustible source of scientific thought and revolutionary action; it carries forward the principles and traditions of Marxism-Leninism which have been tested and proved in the course of this century.

"Marxism-Leninism is strong," Leonid Brezhnev said, "because it rests on revolutionary materialistic dialectics which always requires a concrete analysis of a concrete situation. The living spirit of Marxism-Leninism lies in its close permanent contact with practice, with life itself and in its strictly scientific approach to reality. This is the secret of its eternal youth."^{*}

* * *

Lenin and his followers neither "repealed" any of the principles of Marxism nor did they ever base their theoretical activity on any other principles. The development and substantiation of the principles of Marxism, philosophical principles among them, in the 20th century are typical of the Leninist tradition. This tradition consists in a continuation and development of dialectical materialism which was evolved by Marx and Engels.

Some "Marxologists" maintain that at the turn of the century there was a kind of "rational" school in Marxism which was allegedly closer to the classic legacy of Marx and Engels than Leninism. It pinned its hopes on the "natural course of history" and did not set out to bring about socialist revolution. By this "rational school" they mean the

* L. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 69.

eclectic "line" of interpretation of Marxism by some Second International theorists (Bernstein, Kautsky, etc.) was introduced nothing really new to Marxist philosophy and deviated from its most essential principles, above all from the method of materialist dialectics. Leninism emerged, took shape and developed in the struggle against this and other opportunist trends, against the "centrist" conciliatory attitude to these currents, including Kautsky's attitude. So Roger Garaudy defies historical truth when he attempts in his *Lénine* (1968) to show that in the sphere of philosophy and socio-political thought Lenin until 1913 was a supporter and follower of Kautsky, whom he pronounced to be a representative of "orthodox Marxism" and dogmatism which Garaudy ascribes in passing to Plekhanov as well. In defiance of historical truth Garaudy maintains that Lenin began to shed Kautskian dogmatism only in the works he wrote between 1913 and 1916. Thus Garaudy passes over the fact that Lenin creatively developed Marxism in his earliest theoretical works (in *What the "Friends of the People" Are...*, *The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book*, etc.) and immediately before and during the first Russian revolution (in *What Is to Be Done?*, *Two Tactics...*), and that he made an immense new contribution to Marxist philosophy in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other works written in the first twenty years of his revolutionary-theoretical activity, i.e., before 1913.

It should also be noted that Lenin, unlike Second International Marxist philosophers, including the better amongst them, such as Plekhanov, did not confine himself to applying and propagating Marxist philosophical truths or elaborating specific philosophical problems, those connected with the materialist interpretation of history, for example, but creatively developed the major problems of Marxist philosophy which he treated as a complex, investigating and solving key philosophical issues associated with the new historical revolutionary processes (the transition to the epoch of imperialism, the maturing of the proletarian revolution, of the revolution in natural science, and so on). Lenin, immediately after the death of Engels, continued the philosophical tradition of the founders of Marxism.

However, there has lately emerged a tendency, in some authors' works, to place between Marx and Engels on the one hand, and Lenin on the other, as a "middle link", as representatives of "Western" Marxism distinct from Leninism, some revolutionary theoreticians of the working-class movement of the imperialist epoch, who defended the principles of Marxism on a number of issues but who never went as far as Leninism, particularly in philosophy (Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and other Left-wing German Social-Democrats, Paul Lafargue, and so on). It has been made clear by Soviet and other Marxist philosophers (Kh. N. Momjan, B. A. Chagin, J. Schleifstein, S. I. Popov and others) that, while defending Marxism against bourgeois and social-reformist ideology, the Left-wing revolutionary Social-Democrats in their philosophical and ideological-political activities—by no means devoid of shortcomings and errors—failed, unlike Lenin, to develop materialist dialectics as a science and give dialectical materialism in the twentieth century a new shape meeting the requirements of modern revolutionary practice and theory.

The German and other Left-wing Social-Democratic theoreticians of the Second International confined themselves mostly to the defence and application of the historical-materialist principles of Marxism without, however, developing dialectics further as the logic, theory of knowledge and methodology of Marxism, and underestimated the active scope of theory and subjective, revolutionary activity. Lenin, on the other hand, turned his attention above all to substantiating philosophically the active aspect of human thought, to socio-historical practice.

Unlike the theories of "spontaneity", common among most Social-Democratic Second International theoreticians, including those of the Left, the dialectical-materialist tradition of Marxist philosophy substantiating the proletariat's revolutionary initiative was always an issue of central importance for Lenin.

Lenin noted that "it is Marxism, the theory of dialectical materialism, that is able to encompass these contradictions of living reality, of the living history of capitalism and the working-class movement. . . . But real life, real history *includes* these different tendencies, just as life and

development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity."

The Leninist principle of commitment and the principle of creative development of Marxist theory closely related to it were not confined to Russia and the Russian labour movement, significant as it was, but applied to the international development of Marxist teaching and to the integral apprehension of the process of world development, in particular, its universal laws. Lenin wrote: "By examining the *totality* of opposing tendencies, by reducing them to precisely definable conditions of life and production of the various *classes* of society, by discarding subjectivism and arbitrariness in the choice of a particular 'dominant' idea or in its interpretation, and by revealing that, without exception, all ideas and all the various tendencies *stem* from the condition of the material forces of production, Marxism indicated the way to an all-embracing and comprehensive study of the process of the rise, development, and decline of socio-economic systems."***

Following this tradition evolved by Marx and Engels Lenin substantiated philosophically the dialectically contradictory content of the new epoch during its first stage, the transitional period which is "a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism—or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble".***

At the same time, Lenin provided models of creative elaboration of dialectical logic. He wrote: "Firstly, if we are to have a true knowledge of an object we must look at and examine all its facets, its connections and 'mediacies'. That is something we cannot ever hope to achieve completely, but the rule of comprehensiveness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity.

Secondly, dialectical logic requires that an object should be taken in development, in change, in 'self-movement'....

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 348, 349.

** Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 57.

*** Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 107.

Thirdly, a full 'definition' of an object must include the whole of human experience, both as a criterion of truth and a practical indicator of its connection with human wants. Fourthly, dialectical logic holds that 'truth is always concrete, never abstract'"

These and other examples of Lenin's creative continuation of the philosophical tradition of Marxism have provided an inspiring model for the further advance of philosophical thought in the Soviet Union and the international communist movement.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 94.

CHAPTER IV

PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS IN THE HISTORY OF SOVIET SCIENCE

After the Great October Socialist Revolution, the traditions evolved by Marxism-Leninism were embraced by the masses and became an inseparable part of society's intellectual life. For the first time in history, Marxist-Leninist philosophy emerged as the theoretical and methodological foundation of a scientific world outlook, of progressive socialist culture.

Without proposing to analyse the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the Soviet Union as a whole,¹ this chapter will treat a highly important aspect of the history of philosophy in Soviet society, namely the fruitful and many-sided development of Leninist philosophical traditions and in particular the implementation of Leninist principles with regard to man's philosophical heritage

1. ATTITUDES ADOPTED TO VARIOUS PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS AFTER THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Soviet philosophical science, which has developed, ever since the October Revolution, on the basis of Lenin's ideas, set itself the task of completing the exposure of the ideology of the overthrown exploiting classes, demonstrating to the

¹ An analysis of this development is to be found in a number of recent works by Soviet philosophers. See *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-1965 (in Russian); *October and Scientific Progress*, in two books, Moscow, 1967 (in Russian). "Soviet Science of Philosophy. Some Results of Development and Modern Problems", *Kommunist*, 1967, No 13

intelligentsia and all working people that any advocacy of reactionary bourgeois views, idealist ideas among them, was incompatible with the new social system under construction and modern achievements of science. Lenin told the Party: "We must overcome resistance from the capitalists in all its forms, not only in the military and political spheres, but also ideological resistance, which is the most deep-seated and the strongest."¹ It was not easy to solve this task either in the sphere of philosophy, or that of culture, since scientific (and also philosophical) societies and journals were in the hands of the theoreticians of the old school, while the Party's own were not numerous enough as yet to take over all scientific centres and press organs at once. Nevertheless, despite all the pressure of political and government work during the hard years of civil war and economic dislocation, Communist scholars and publicists (V. V. Adoratsky, A. S. Bubnov, V. A. Bystriansky, V. V. Vorovsky, P. I. Lebedev-Polyansky, A. V. Lunacharsky, V. I. Nevsky, M. N. Pokrovsky, M. V. Serebryakov, I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, Y. M. Yaroslavsky and others) wrote articles for theoretical journals, delivered lectures and took part in debates, speaking out against reactionary bourgeois philosophical and sociological "theories" and the anti-Leninist conceptions set forth by the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and other opponents of revolutionary Marxism, which were still considerably widespread in the early period of Soviet government. Lenin appended to the 2nd edition of his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, published in 1920, an article by V. I. Nevsky, written at his own request, entitled "Dialectical Materialism and the Philosophy of Defunct Reaction", which exposed the latest works of A. A. Bogdanov (*Tectology*, *The Philosophy of Living Experience*, etc.),² who propagated under the guise of "proletarian culture" "bourgeois and reactionary views".³

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 31, p. 370

It should be noted in this connection that attempts of some contemporary authors to represent Bogdanov's "universal organisational science" as foreshadowing cybernetics, the scientific organisation of labour, etc., are strange and devoid of any serious scientific foundation, to say the least.

¹ V. I. Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 14, p. 21.

We know from history that even brilliant minds have often made mistakes, fearing lest a victorious popular revolution should "trample underfoot" or reject the priceless achievements of philosophical thought and treasures of culture and art. Sufficient to recall Heine who feared that revolutionaries might demolish museums and theatres and burn down palaces and parks to plant potatoes instead. There was some danger indeed after the October Revolution of 1917 of the cultural treasures of the past, including our philosophical heritage, being ignored, but this was due not to the socialist revolution, not to its architect, the revolutionary proletariat, but to the fellow-travellers of the revolution, to petty-bourgeois anarchistic elements, who concealed their intentions behind "Leftist" phraseology. Bogdanov's *Proletkult* theories, for example.

In the very first days of Soviet rule, petty-bourgeois "Leftist" and nihilist attempts to negate all the culture of the past came up against the Communist Party's line aimed at assimilating and critically refashioning the country's cultural heritage, including its philosophical heritage, and at drawing non-Communist artists and scientists including democratic philosophers of the old school into joint scientific and cultural activities.

Some foreign philosophers and sociologists, particularly the sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, who was justly criticised by Lenin, alleged that the first period of Soviet rule had destructive implications for all spheres of social life and culture, and it was not for some time that it was superseded by a constructive period. These assertions are utterly untenable.

As historical fact demonstrated in the early years after the revolution, when Lenin and the Party were laying the foundations of the new social system and fighting to assert the scientific world outlook they pursued "destruction" tactics aimed at quashing the influence of reactionary philosophical theories such as religious obscurantism and anti-popular sociological "research" of the kind Sorokin engaged in. Further, immediately after the October Revolution series of the finest works of Russian and world literature and philosophy were put out in mass editions and were thus brought within the reach of the masses, while man's

cultural, and also philosophical heritage was being studied on a broad scale.

As early as 1920 Lenin in his letter to Central Committee secretaries suggested a whole range of works by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century materialists be published in translation. In reply to a note written by Y. Yaroslavsky, who was a Central Committee secretary at that time, Lenin recommended that non-Party philosophers, namely L. I. Axelrod-Ortodox and A. M. Deborin, should be drawn into the project and help prepare and deliver series of lectures on the history of materialism.

Overcoming the negative, dogmatic traditions of the Second International, those of the Trotskyite variety among others, was an important aspect of the ideological struggle waged by Marxist thinkers, including those specialising in the history of philosophy, a struggle for a revolutionary-critical approach to the ideological traditions of the working-class movement. The theoreticians of the Second International, as well as the Mensheviks and Trotskyites, who kept repeating that the socialist revolution could start only in industrially-developed European countries and was capable of winning through only provided that it took place simultaneously in all or in most developed European countries, chose to ignore the changes in society stemming from the uneven economic and political development, characteristic of imperialism, and in particular from the October Revolution which had triumphed in a country in which capitalism was far from advanced. This approach was due to a negative, false conception of Leninism as of the theory and tactics of the proletariat in a backward agrarian country, and to a denial of the international character and philosophical significance of Lenin's theories.

After the October Revolution, the historical destinies of different philosophical traditions that had grown up before the revolution could be traced quite easily in Russia. In the Soviet era, Marxist-Leninist philosophy rejected once and for all reactionary philosophical traditions such as religious ideology, theosophical and mystical philosophical doctrines, which left their imprint on philosophical thinking and the entire intellectual life of society. Marxist-Leninist philosophy categorically rejected aloofness with regard to the peo-

ple's interests, which characterised the idealist philosophy of ideologists from landowners and bourgeois circles. The fierce resistance of reactionary idealist philosophers to the Soviet system chosen by the people, their malicious slander of Marxism, materialism and modern science compelled the Soviet state soon after October 1917 to protect Soviet people from the "philosophical" preaching of the reactionary ideologists supported by landowners and the bourgeoisie and deport the fervid opponents of the Soviets, the idealist philosophers N. Berdyayev, N. Lossky and others from the Soviet Republic.

Lenin and the Communist Party openly and unequivocally rejected the reactionary philosophical tradition associated with Vladimir Solovyov, the contributors to *Uchki* and other supporters of religious philosophical doctrines, which even before the revolution had catered for the interests and intellectual requirements of the ruling classes and which, after October 1917, were immediately promoted in the interests of counter-revolution by N. Berdyayev, L. Lopatin, P. Struve, E. Trubetskoi, S. Frank and other reactionary philosophers. The latter not only spread their retrograde philosophical and socio-political views and slandered the people, describing it as "the slave of dark spontaneous forces" (Trubetskoi) and its revolution as "the revolt of matter against the spirit" (Berdyayev), but joined the political struggle against the people in power.

So, for instance, the erstwhile "legal Marxist" and subsequent ideologist of the Constitutional-Democrat counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, Pyotr Struve, who condemned the socialist revolution and supported the political ascendancy of the landowners and powerful bourgeoisie, wrote in *Russkaya Mysl*: "It does not matter in the least under what name the devastating contagion will be crushed. But crushed and burnt out of the Russians' life it must be, come what may.... Russian socialism... must... be overcome and swept away."²

While many ideologists of bourgeois reaction abroad extol

² P. Struve, "What Is Revolution and Counter-revolution After?", *Russkaya Mysl*, Books XI-XII, Moscow-Petrograd, November-December 1917, pp. 60-61.

to this day the theosophical writings of Solovyov and Berdvyayev's religious existentialism, it would be a grave mistake for certain Marxists to see in the works of the Russian idealists of the early twentieth century a valuable contribution to Russian philosophical thought and suggest revising the attitude to their religious-mystical philosophy, an attitude defined on a number of occasions by Lenin.²

It was a different matter with the tradition in science and philosophy that was developed by advocates of materialism in natural science (I. P. Pavlov, A. N. Bach, V. I. Vernadsky and others), by Russian Orientalists (S. F. Oldenburg, F. I. Shcherbatsky, V. M. Alekseyev, A. P. Barannikov, I. Y. Krachkovsky and others), and so on. Although some of the philosophers and scientists of the old school before the October Revolution vacillated between materialism and idealism in philosophy or, being materialists, failed to come as far as consistent, militant materialism in philosophy, their specialised research contained, nevertheless, objectively true scientific data facilitating a philosophical apprehension of the world. Therefore with respect to this kind of philosophical tradition Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which came to hold sway in the Soviet Union, took a different stand from that with respect to the reactionary idealists.

The knowledge and experience of many philosophers of the old school engaged in research into the history of phi-

² Assertions by D. Klein and P. Sorokin that Soviet philosophical science of today, unlike that of earlier periods, is turning to the philosophical tradition of the Slovoophiles, Solovyov, Berdvyayev and other Russian idealists, "rehabilitating them", are absolutely groundless. Scientific, critical study of the philosophical ideas of Solovyov, Berdvyayev, Lossky and other Russian idealists (to whom the Soviet historians of philosophy used to pay very little attention) and the publication of Marxist works on these and other representatives of Russian idealism are by no means needed to "rehabilitate" this reactionary philosophical tradition of tsarist Russia. They are necessary in the context of the ideological struggle against the continuing influence of the reactionary teachings of Solovyov, Berdvyayev and other idealist philosophers abroad, an influence which still on occasions assumes new and even more distorted forms. Marxist works must also be published in order to restore the comprehensive picture of the history of philosophical knowledge in Russia, which developed in the struggle against reactionary schools of idealist philosophy.

osophy, logic and aesthetic doctrines, who used to adhere to an idealist world outlook but now became *bona fide* Soviet scholars (P. P. Blonsky, S. I. Danelia, A. F. Losev, A. O. Makovelsky, Sh. I. Nutsubidze, the logicians P. S. Popov, V. Sezemanas and others) found extensive application in Soviet society. Some of them, as a result of difficult and often painful searchings and under the impact of the achievements of the Soviet system and Marxist-Leninist ideology, came to embrace dialectical materialism, becoming active participants in Soviet scientific research and builders of the new, socialist society. Experienced philosophers of the old school, former idealists (A. Kubitsky, B. Stolpner, P. Yushkevich, B. Vogt and others), were broadly enlisted in translating and editing philosophical classics and they did much to help popularise the philosophical heritage of the past.

In Soviet science, the studies pursued by the aforementioned and other philosophers of the old school were approached from a Marxist angle. Soviet science did not discard but, on the contrary, used the logical apparatus found in the works of G. Chelpanov and other scholars of formal logic, without, however, stopping at the concepts developed by it but carrying forward the modern logic of scientific thinking, including symbolic logic, on the basis of dialectical materialism.

The Communist Party and the philosophical research which developed under its guidance, never adopted a "neutral" position with relation to idealist philosophy. For many years a determined ideological-theoretical campaign was carried on in the press and Soviet scientific and educational establishments against idealist philosophical theories which found their way into the press (especially in the twenties) and lecture courses. Any tolerance of idealist views and their propagation is incompatible with the Leninist tradition which took root in Soviet science after October 1917. Lenin resolutely came out against, among other things, the propaganda of the reactionary ideas of Oswald Spengler, a German bourgeois philosopher, whose book *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (*Decline of the West*) was such a sensation in the West. When Berdyayev, Stepun and other Russian reactionary idealists published in 1922 a collection of articles

entitled *Oswald Spengler and the Decline of the West*, Lenin angrily condemned this publication, openly hostile to Marxism and the proletariat, as a "literary screen for a white-guard organisation".

Lenin also resolutely came out against the counter-revolutionary ideology of the contributors to the *Smena Vekh* (*Changing Landmarks*) journal in 1921-22, in which a thinly disguised advocacy of the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union went hand in hand with attempts at restoring bourgeois ideology and idealist philosophy. Lenin's ideas about the struggle of the socialist world outlook against a revival of the philosophy of the overthrown exploiting classes, expressed, for instance, in his report to the 11th Party Congress (1922), were substantiated in works by A. S. Bubnov, A. V. Lunacharsky, V. I. Nevsky, P. I. Lebedev-Polvansky, I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov and other Marxists, spearheaded against the reactionary idealist concepts which were revived and propagated in the Soviet Union in the period of the New Economic Policy (NEP).

On Lenin's instructions, some prominent figures in the Communist Party came out with criticism of religious and other reactionary trends of philosophical thought. In an article "The Nostradamuses of the Twentieth Century", V. I. Nevsky subjected to scathing and compelling criticism the writings of the mystic and idealist, E. Radlov. Nevsky showed that in the situation of social crisis that set in after World War I "even the most remote sources of theology exert an irresistible appeal. Whatever a modern bourgeois scholar takes up, be it philosophy, history, psychology or ethics, he will end up with the Lord and without doubt start criticising socialism . . . the great change being experienced by the world has shaken to their very foundations the principles of bourgeois thinking as well".**

Following Lenin's idea formulated in his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" the supporters of dialectical materialism concluded an enduring alliance with the scientists—supporters of natural-scientific materialism—and

* *Lenin Miscellany XXXVI*, Moscow, 1959, p. 447 (in Russian).

* V. Nevsky, "The Nostradamuses of the Twentieth Century", *Pod znamenem Marksizma*, 1922, No. 4, pp. 98, 99.

helped the latter to overcome their past errors and oversights with respect to philosophy and raise their philosophical deductions to the level of conscious and militant dialectical materialism. Valuable works of the Russian school of oriental studies which carried out a truthful and profound analysis of the centuries-old traditions of Eastern philosophy and culture and prepared the ground for the Marxists' struggle against the colonialist concepts of "Eurocentrism" in the history of philosophy and culture and for the Eastern peoples' independent cultural and intellectual development, enhanced the achievement of Soviet scholarship. These and many other facts show that Marxist philosophy, particularly under socialism when it forms the basis of the prevailing world outlook, can reject the idealist aspects of the former philosophical tradition and adopt, use and develop the logical concepts, scientific ideas and "conceptual material" amassed by non-Marxist doctrines, remoulding and using them to promote the development of new traditions and dialectical-materialist deductions from the achievements of science. This position of Marxist-Leninist philosophy with respect to philosophical traditions and their exponents opens up favourable prospects for rapprochement between the finest representatives of the intelligentsia of the capitalist and developing countries and Marxists.

Marxist philosophical thought in the Soviet Union develops on a basis of the progressive philosophical traditions of pre-Marxist doctrines and the rational elements in the philosophy of French eighteenth-century materialists, Hegel and Feuerbach, and Russian materialists—the revolutionary democrats of the nineteenth century. These rational elements were expounded in works by V. F. Asmus, G. F. Aleksandrov, K. S. Bakradze, G. S. Vasetsky, M. A. Dynnik, I. K. Luppel, E. P. Sitkovsky, O. V. Trakhtenberg and other Soviet historians of philosophy.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not simply assimilate rational ideas and concepts of the progressive philosophical tradition but subjects them to scientific and critical analysis in connection with the historical conditions in which these ideas and concepts emerged, singles out the fresh contributions they represented in comparison with the ideas and concepts of earlier philosophy, how true they were and to

what extent met the social requirements of their own historical epoch.

At the same time, Marxist-Leninist philosophy makes the most of the opportunities for "supplementing" such philosophical ideas and concepts with new content meeting the historical requirements of the new epoch, which coincide with the basic interests of the proletariat. So, for instance, the materialist and socialist traditions of Russian revolutionary democracy, which centred round the "anthropological principle"—the substantiation and defence of the interests and needs of "the common people", the struggle for the freedom and happiness of the working-man—are adopted and carried forward by Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Marxism-Leninism does not, however, refer back to the limited "anthropological principle" but provides a new solution to the problem of man (the "anthropological problem", as it is often inexactly termed in philosophical literature). Marxism-Leninism demonstrates that man's freedom and happiness, his development as an individual in specific historical conditions depend on his social activeness, on the struggle waged by the progressive forces of mankind under the leadership of the working class for the socialist transformation of society.

Marxist aesthetic thought in the Soviet Union after October 1917, adopts, continues and successfully carries forward the aesthetic principles of the critical realism of the Russian revolutionary democrats (realism, principled commitment and the national character of literature and art, and so on). But the aesthetic principles of socialist realism elaborated by Marxist-Leninist philosophers are complete with new ideological-theoretical content, fundamentally different from the aesthetics of critical realism. Marxist aesthetics is based on dialectical and historical materialism; it substantiates scientifically the active intervention of the subject (in the present instance, the artist) in the reflection of reality in art, provides a scientific explanation of the process of development and the contradictions of life reflected in art, brings out the active role played by man and the progressive social forces in helping new ideas assert themselves over the old, and so on. All this refutes the conjectures of the "critics" of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and aesthetics to the effect that

the materialist theory on which they are based is allegedly contemplative and metaphysical, that it denies the role played by the subject (man) and his socio-historical activity, ignores the dialectical principle of development and has allegedly been taken over from eighteenth-century materialism and materialism of the Russian enlighteners, which with no justification they describe as contemplative, metaphysically limited, and so on.

Ever since it came into being, Soviet philosophical science has focussed its attention on continuing, assimilating and creatively developing the philosophical traditions of Marxism. It has been possible in the Soviet epoch to assimilate, defend and carry further Marxist philosophical tradition above all because the Party and its academic institutions have collected together, systematised, studied and put to active use the entire philosophical legacy of Marx and Engels, many of whose works (*The German Ideology*, *From the Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right*, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, *Mathematic Manuscripts*, *Dialectics of Nature*, much of the correspondence between Marx and Engels, etc.) had never been published or even heard about before October 1917. Marxist philosophical tradition was in a position to develop successfully in the Soviet Union after the social-opportunist interpretation of the doctrine of Marx and Engels, which became prevalent in the Second International owing to the activities of Kautsky and others, had been replaced by a Leninist, creative interpretation of Marxism and of its scientific dialectical-materialist nature and revolutionary essence.

This creative understanding of Marxism and its philosophy penetrated the consciousness of the Soviet working people and the ideology of the international working-class movement after the October Revolution, thanks to the ideological-political work of Lenin, the Bolshevik Party under his leadership, and the Communist International which he founded. The publication, in 1929, of Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* was of vital significance for a profound understanding of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, for, like *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other works by Lenin, that have been translated into many foreign languages, they graphically demonstrated his creative approach to Marxist philosophy and his

thorough and comprehensive elaboration of materialist dialectics

Soviet philosophers (such as V. V. Adoratsky, V. A. Bystriansky, M. B. Mitin, P. F. Yudin, F. V. Konstantinov, F. A. Gorokhov) and foreign philosophers (such as T. Pavlov, S. Ganovsky, H. Duncker) indicated in their works published in the twenties and thirties that in developing dialectical and historical materialism and the entire Marxist doctrine with reference to the conditions prevailing in the twentieth century Lenin inaugurated a new stage in the history of Marxism and Marxist philosophy. Recognition of this scientific truth which has become firmly established in the world communist movement was reached after an acute ideological struggle that had to be waged in the 1920s and '30s against social-reformist, Trotskyite and other opportunist views on Lenin's theoretical legacy, a struggle which also involved the correction of errors made by some Marxist philosophers in the Soviet Union (A. M. Deborin, N. A. Karev, I. K. Luppel and others) and abroad in their interpretation of Lenin's philosophical legacy.*

Marxist philosophical tradition which Lenin had already developed and elevated to a higher level in the imperialist epoch began, in the post-October epoch, to gain a hold upon the minds of the Communists, the vanguard of the international proletariat, the revolutionary intelligentsia and then those of millions of members of the working class and other working people. It is not, however, in its mass-scale dissemination alone that the modern significance of the philosophical tradition of Marxism-Leninism lies. This philosophical tradition supported by millions owes its force to the fact that it does not hesitate to replace obsolete theoretical precepts and views by new ones, and, being of a revolutionary-critical character, keenly responds to every pulsation of life, creatively analysing new social processes and scientific discoveries.

* See *History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Vol VI, Chapter 3, § 1, Moscow, 1957-65 (in Russian); *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).

2. MARXIST-LENINIST DEFENCE OF THE FINEST PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS. THEIR STUDY AND DEVELOPMENT BY SOVIET PHILOSOPHERS

In a number of his works written after the October Revolution, in particular the article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", Lenin reminded Marxists of the most vital scientific tasks facing them: creatively to assimilate all of value that had been achieved over more than two thousand years of the evolution of human thought, to carry forward the study and materialist interpretation of the history of dialectics, started by Karl Marx, in particular that of Hegel's dialectics, applying dialectics to the study of modern history, the current experience of the revolutionary movement and the latest achievements of science.

Even in the grim years of the Civil War, foreign armed intervention and economic dislocation, the publication and study of the philosophical heritage of the past, in particular with regard to historical thought, became one of the most vital ideological and theoretical tasks. The *Library of Materialism* series brought out works by Feuerbach, Diderot, Lamettrie, Hobbes, Holbach, Toland and Priestley. Plato's works were also published, and in the thirties the principal works of Aristotle, Hegel, Descartes, Spinoza, Helvétius, Schelling and other classic philosophers were published. Such publications were continued in subsequent decades as well.

In the twenties, practically all the works written by the founders of Marxism had been collected together at the Marx and Engels Institute in Moscow. Unpublished works by Marx and Engels and later their collected works were put out in Russian translation and in the original. In this way conditions were provided for the scientific elaboration of the history of the philosophical theory of Marxism.

The Communist (initially Socialist) Academy and then the USSR Academy of Sciences and Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Azerbaijan, Yerevan, Central Asian and other universities embarked on research into many problems of the world history of philosophy.

Another highly important objective which the struggle of Marxists-Leninists to uphold the finest philosophical tra-

ditions set itself immediately after the October Revolution was the elimination of vulgar-sociological views on the philosophical heritage of the past, disseminated by petty-bourgeois and bourgeois intellectual fellow-travellers of the revolution who had fallen under the influence of anti-Leninist trends (Bogdanovism, and so on). Mechanistic, largely positivist views whose supporters denied, in effect, the independence of philosophy, replacing it by numerous conclusions drawn from contemporary natural science, and rejected the dialectical tradition, especially that of classical German philosophy, views that had gained currency among some groups of philosophers and natural scientists in the twenties, were subjected to cogent criticism. These views also reflected a one-sided approach to the materialist philosophical heritage, reducing it in the main to the defence of the principle of determinism, etc., thus failing to understand the role played by dialectics as a science, logic and theory of knowledge.

In the first country where a victorious proletarian dictatorship was established conditions were provided from the very start for free development of progressive philosophical thought among all Soviet peoples and for the preservation and development of their cultural heritage, including their philosophical heritage. Thanks to the victorious October Revolution which laid the foundations of friendship and co-operation among the emancipated peoples, the philosophical, sociological and aesthetic ideas of prominent thinkers from among the various Soviet peoples—most of whom did not have the chance to work as professional philosophers but engaged in creative activity in the sphere of literature, sociopolitical thought and science, providing spiritual inspiration for the development of the liberation movement, progressive culture and social thought of their own and other peoples—were discovered anew and often rescued from oblivion. Works by Russian thinkers and those from among other Soviet peoples were thoroughly studied, freed of the distortions introduced by tsarist censorship and studied from a Marxist standpoint. Hundreds of such scientific editions of philosophical works of the past have been published in the Soviet Union.

The extensive research into the philosophical and sociopolitical thought of the Soviet peoples carried on in our

country have enabled Soviet people and progressive men and women everywhere to appreciate properly and approach in a new way the creative work and world outlook of both progressive Russian thinkers and scientists—Lomonosov, Mendeleev, Mechnikov, Sechenov and others—and thinkers from among other Soviet peoples—Shevchenko and Franko, Akhundov, Chavchavadze, Nalbandyan, Abai Kunanbayev, Jan Rainis, Karl Jakobson and many others, and also the scientific works of Ibn Sina, Farabi, Ulugbek and other thinkers who developed the progressive philosophical ideas of their times.

The Marxist-Leninist position with relation to the philosophical traditions of various Soviet peoples had to be defended in an intense struggle against bourgeois-nationalist distortions of culture, social thought and philosophy, such as, for example, the bourgeois-nationalist "single stream" concept (Mikhail Grushevsky in the Ukraine and others), according to which the development of the social and philosophical thought of different peoples is not a result of the class struggle in which they are involved but is an indivisible single stream of development of universal culture and social thought. Idealisation of the patriarchal and feudal past of the peoples of the Soviet Union, which had on occasions been represented as a "golden age", the up-dating of the views of certain thinkers of the past, isolation of the philosophical tradition of individual Soviet peoples from the traditions of the other peoples of the USSR and foreign peoples and other distortions of the history of philosophical thought have become a thing of the past.

After the October Revolution and in particular from the thirties onwards serious attention was paid to research into the materialist and revolutionary-democratic traditions of Russian philosophical thought. Contrary to the views put forward in many prerevolutionary works and certain others published in the twenties and early thirties on the history of Russian philosophy, it has in recent years been demonstrated that Russian philosophical thought was not a reiteration of Western ideas in a backward country but, as reflected in the work of its finest representatives and especially the classic figures of Russian materialist philosophy Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, was independent and

original, especially in the sphere of aesthetics, ethics and social theory, and paved the way for memorable scientific discoveries and ideas, exerting a beneficial impact on the emancipation movement, literature and art.

After the 7th Comintern Congress (1935) which emphasised the need for preserving and carrying forward the peoples' democratic and freedom-loving traditions and culture, the study and popularisation of the traditions of Russian progressive philosophy, as well as of the progressive traditions of the philosophy and social thought in other countries, were closely associated with the new tasks implicit in the struggle against fascism and reaction, which was launched by the working class and the masses led by the Communists.

The campaign against mechanism which actually renounced the dialectical tradition, and above all Hegel's dialectics, and often reduced the precepts of dialectical materialism to the level of former mechanistic or natural-scientific materialism, which was launched in the twenties, was of great significance for the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the Soviet Union. Formalistic and, with regard to some points, even idealist errors in the history of philosophy, made by the noted Soviet philosopher, A. M. Deborin, and his supporters in the twenties, were also subjected to criticism above all for approximating Marx's materialist dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics, conceiving of Marx's philosophy as a combination of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism and failing to understand the philosophical significance of Leninism and the role it played in the creative development of Marxist philosophy.

In the Soviet Union, new branches of historical-philosophical knowledge have been opened up, which neither existed nor could possibly have done in Russia before the revolution as independent scientific subjects, viz., the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the history of Russian philosophy and the philosophy of other Soviet peoples, the history of philosophical and social thought in the national liberation movements in the East, and the history (and critical analysis) of bourgeois philosophical and social doctrines of modern times. Since the October Revolution serious monographs and treatises of a general character, elucidating major problems of the history of philosophy from the standpoint of Marxism-

Leninism, have been produced in each of these fields of knowledge.

Immediately after the October Revolution work started on the elaboration of the history of philosophy as an integral process extending to different countries and periods, the study of which is indispensable to the development, detailed understanding and application of the philosophy of Marxism. During the last fifty years a vast literature on diverse problems of the history of philosophy has been produced.*

Elaboration of a Marxist scientific concept of the history of philosophy contrasting with the modern bourgeois ideologists' views on the subject has been a notable achievement of Soviet historical-philosophical science. Works providing a general picture of philosophical development, written by Soviet historians of philosophy between 1940 and 1970 are of particular significance in this respect.**

Marxist philosophical science has achieved a great task in restoring historical truth in the assessment of the philosophy and social thought of the Eastern countries. Bourgeois philosophers and Orientalists in the West either regard Eastern philosophy as merely mythological and religious and therefore not worthy of serious study, or, conversely, see in its religious and contemplative aspect, its "exclusiveness" and "immobility", the greatest possible merits. Studies by Soviet scientists (N. I. Konrad, A. O. Makovelsky, V. K. Chaloyan and others) demonstrate that the development of both Eastern and Western philosophy is governed by the same objective laws and that their different forms can be explained by social factors.

Soviet historical-philosophical science which rejects the bourgeois concepts of both "Eurocentrism" and "Asiacentrism" sees its internationalist duty to lie in the study of the

* The catalogue of literature on the history of philosophy for 1917-1962, published by the Fundamental Social Sciences Library of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which includes works in Russian on the history of foreign pre-Marxist philosophy, numbers over three thousand books and articles by about 1,500 authors. (See *History of Foreign Pre-Marxist Philosophy*, Bibliography of Literature, Issued in the USSR in Russian in 1917-62, Moscow, 1963, in Russian).

** See *History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-65; *A Short Essay of History of Philosophy*, Second edition, Moscow, 1971 (in Russian)

philosophical thought of the Eastern peoples as an integral part of world culture. It would be a deviation from the internationalist principles of Leninism to refuse to investigate thoroughly the century-old traditions of Eastern—and, in particular, Chinese—philosophy because it has now been made an object of falsification by nationalist and Leftist sectarian elements, especially the Maoists, who are trying to isolate Eastern philosophical thought from the general historical-philosophical process and are reviving and fostering idealist concepts of the ancient and medieval East (Confucianism, for example).

As capitalism has entered its imperialist stage and especially at its present stage characterised by a general economic, ideological and political crisis, bourgeois philosophy has undergone a substantial change. The qualitative features essential to modern bourgeois philosophy not to be found in the classical philosophical schools of the era of bourgeois revolutions (the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) were already disclosed by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*; the principles outlined in this work are those which Marxist philosophers take as their starting-point. Compared with pre-Marxist bourgeois philosophy, modern bourgeois philosophy has lost its former progressive significance, becoming a “defensive” philosophy, and has broken off its ties with progressive science. Despite the great variety of the philosophical schools of modern bourgeois thought, the latter is not rich ideologically and is not equipped to supply correct answers to major philosophical and sociological problems of the present, furnish a scientific world outlook, prognosticate mankind’s future and arm men for the struggle to uphold lofty ideals.

In a number of works on modern idealist philosophy and monographs treating individual philosophical trends or bourgeois philosophy in individual countries, Soviet philosophers have subjected to committed and principled critical study of a high level the bourgeois philosophical schools of the twentieth century, such as neo-positivism, existentialism, neo-Thomism, pragmatism, and so on.*

* See K. Bakradze, *On the History of Modern Bourgeois Philosophy*, Tbilisi, 1960, A. Bogomolov, *English and American Bourgeois Philosophy*

Soviet philosophers have also turned their back on the primitive concept current in the 1930s and 1940s, according to which all twentieth-century bourgeois philosophy was purely reactionary. They demonstrate that besides openly retrograde doctrines the purpose of which is to justify the capitalist system, in modern bourgeois philosophy liberal-idealist concepts exist side by side with highly involved and contradictory trends which, for all their basic idealism, nevertheless do possess scope for theoretical investigation, an original approach to philosophical problems and allow of opportunities for finding interesting solutions to the latter.

The history of Soviet philosophical science, its major landmarks and results and the problems it is faced with are closely associated with the continuation and development of Leninist traditions in philosophy.

3. HISTORICAL LANDMARKS AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LENINIST TRADITIONS IN SOVIET PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCE

The development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the Soviet Union is a component part of the international philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism and one of the basic elements of the international history of the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy. In our view, it is wrong to use the term "Soviet philosophy" which was introduced in modern philosophical literature by opponents of Marxism-

of Imperialist Epoch, Moscow, 1964; A. Bogomolov, *The Theory of Development in Bourgeois Philosophy of 19th and 20th Centuries*, Moscow, 1962; A. Bogomolov, *German Bourgeois Philosophy Since 1865*, Moscow, 1969; *History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-65; I. Kon, *Positivism in Sociology. A Historical Survey*, Leningrad, 1964; I. Narsky, *Modern Positivism*, Moscow, 1961; S. Oduyev, *Following the Paths of Zarathustra*, Moscow, 1971; T. Oizerman, *Alienation and Bourgeois Myth About Marxism*, Moscow, 1965; L. Skvortsov, *Ideology and Tactics of Anti-Communism*, Moscow, 1967; *Modern Philosophy and Sociology in Western Europe and the Americas*, Moscow, 1964; *Modern Existentialism. Critical Essays*, Moscow, 1966; S. Efirov, *Italian Bourgeois Philosophy of the 20th Century*, Moscow, 1968; M. Yakovlev, *Marxism and Modern Bourgeois History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1964; I. Yakushevsky, *Leninism, Revolution and "Sovietology"*, Leningrad, 1968; etc. (All in Russian.) T. Oizerman, *Problems of the History of Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, 1973.

Leninism (Joseph Bocheński, Thomas Blakeley, Gustav Wetter and others) and which, unfortunately, has gained some currency in Marxist and progressive literature abroad and is sometimes to be found in Soviet literature as well. In fact, however, no specific "Soviet philosophy" separate from international Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought of the world communist movement of the current epoch has ever existed. When the Soviet state was set up more than fifty years ago, Soviet philosophical science, which takes its start from Lenin's works written after the October Revolution, came into existence and began to develop. Just as there exist Soviet mathematical, physical and biological sciences (but not "Soviet mathematics", "Soviet physics", "Soviet biology", or the like), as well as Soviet historical, economic and juridical sciences, so is one justified in speaking of Soviet philosophical science. The international philosophy of Marxism-Leninism finds expression in Soviet philosophical science just as it does in the Marxist philosophical science of Bulgaria, Hungary, Germany, Poland, Italy, France and many other countries where it is developed by Communist parties, philosophers and other Marxist intellectuals loyal to Leninism. This, however, does not mean that the history of Soviet philosophical science which covers a period of more than fifty years has exhibited no distinctive features of development. Such features, indeed, exist and they consist, above all, in the following:

1. Marxist-Leninist philosophy began to develop in the Soviet Union at a time when the country of the pioneers and first builders of socialism was embarking on the unexplored path of the construction of a new society. The formation of socialism and its theoretical thought proceeded in the USSR in a situation of the most acute class struggle within the country and in the international arena, as well as in a situation of difficult ideological quests for solutions to new philosophical and sociological problems. The intensity of the struggle in the philosophical and theoretical field, especially marked in the first two decades after the October Revolution, can be put down to these socio-historical factors and the novelty of the problems philosophy and sociology have had to tackle in the modern epoch, not to any "Soviet aggressiveness" or "dogmatic narrow-mindedness" that bour-

geois Marxologists and revisionists impute to Soviet Marxists. Spurious offshoots of Marxist thought, foreign to Leninism, such as the Stalin personality cult and elements of subjectivism and time-serving, which are not at all natural or essential to the development of philosophy and social thought in a socialist country, can be explained to a certain extent by the complicated processes at work in the USSR and the socio-historical conditions shaping Soviet development which prevailed there in the past owing to the capitalist encirclement, as well as by distortions of the Party's Leninist policy and deviation from Leninist traditions.

2. As it embarked on the socialist path, the Soviet Republic did not have at its service a great many highly qualified professional Marxist philosophers, for Marxist ideas were alien to most philosophers and sociologists in pre-revolutionary Russia: considerable effort had to be made during a large number of years, especially during the first two decades after October 1917, when socialism was being constructed in the Soviet Union in the face of bitter opposition from the remnants of the exploiting classes and capitalist elements, to overcome the resistance of anti-socialist and anti-Marxist forces in philosophy, science and social thought and to win over to dialectical materialism the figures from the scientific and cultural world who had been under the influence of bourgeois, feudal-clerical or petty-bourgeois ideology.

3. Being a multinational country, the Soviet Union has particularly varied philosophical and cultural traditions, the finest of which are continued and developed in the Marxist philosophical thought of each Soviet people. The transition of a number of peoples to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage, the elimination of economic and cultural backwardness among many peoples and nationalities on the basis of socialist construction, the elimination of former national exclusiveness and cultural isolation, as well as the old, backward patterns of everyday life, struggle against the remnants of national animosity, nationalist narrow-mindedness, and so on, placed before the philosophers and sociologists among the Soviet peoples specific problems. This required of philosophers and social scientists an analysis and practical solution of topical problems connected with socialist development.

4. Twenty of the fifty-five years that Soviet society has been in existence have been spent in fighting wars thrust upon the Soviet state by imperialist aggressors and rehabilitating the war-devastated economy. The first-ever socialist transformations were effected in a country whose productive forces were not highly developed and whose general economic level was rather poor while before the October Revolution its technology, economy and administration had been most backward. Much of the work undertaken by Soviet philosophical science in the past was concentrated for some years, and still is to a considerable extent concentrated on the ideological and political struggle against imperialism and curbing its ideological influence, providing theoretical substantiation to socialist transformations and popularising the ideas of scientific communism and the Party's Leninist policy among the masses. In the conditions of the construction of socialism and communism, philosophical science concentrates its attention mainly on moulding the scientific world outlook of the working class, the new intelligentsia and the broad mass of the people. All this has left its mark on the history of Soviet philosophical science whose representatives had to popularise science, speak at meetings, write for periodicals and engage actively in other kinds of practical ideological work.

In view of all these features of Soviet philosophy and the difficulties and obstacles it encountered in the course of its development, it would be wrong to assess philosophical thought in the Soviet Union as being merely of a popularising, propagandist turn and possessing no independent scientific significance. Still more wrong and incompatible with historical truth is the claim, often made abroad to the effect that Soviet philosophical science is "dogmatic", "etatist-pragmatic" or "scientistic-positivist" and to falsely and maliciously charge Soviet Marxists, philosophers among them, with "distorting" Marxism, departing from Marxism-Leninism, and so on. Right-wing revisionist theoreticians (for example, Garaudy in his *Marxism in the Twentieth Century*) distort the truth when they assert that Marxist thought in the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries was in a state of "stagnation" and "sclerosis", that for nearly twenty-five years of our troubled age it "slumbered like a sleeping

beauty". "Left"-wing revisionists and sectarians, advocates of Maoism in particular, accuse Soviet Marxists of bourgeois degeneration and revisionism. Like the Trotskyites, contemporary "Left"-wing opportunists would belittle the significance of Lenin's ideological and theoretical legacy, substituting their own metaphysical and subjectivist concepts for Lenin's doctrine and method. These fabrications, the purpose of which is to oust Leninism and its traditions from the philosophical and social thought of the international communist movement, are disproved by the actual history of Marxism and Marxist philosophy in the Soviet Union. Certain illusions entertained by some Soviet philosophers in the past and subjectivist and dogmatic errors they committed during the period of the cult of personality, for example, cannot refute the indisputable fact that taken as a whole, Soviet philosophical science, always loyal to Marxism-Leninism, has been defending and continuing its traditions and that it plays a great and active part in the defence, dissemination and further development of dialectical and historical materialism.

Lenin's apt observation to the effect that no errors or temporary blunders that might occur in Soviet society could detract from its indisputably great merits is fully applicable to Soviet philosophical science, as well as to the whole of Marxist thought in the USSR. In exposing the opponents of Marxism who endeavoured to make capital out of every mistake the Soviet state committed, Lenin wrote: "For every hundred mistakes we commit, and which the bourgeoisie and their lackeys . . . shout about to the whole world, 10,000 great and heroic deeds are performed, greater and more heroic because they are simple and inconspicuous amidst everyday life. . . ."^{*}

At various stages of the history of Marxist philosophy after the October Revolution, despite all misconceptions and errors and all the difficulties and obstacles that stood in the way of Marxist philosophy, the continuity of Marxist philosophical thought endured and developed. The Communist Party and Soviet scientists have always endeavoured to combine their assimilation of the findings of the previous history of philosophy with a creative elaboration of fresh philos-

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 72

ophical and social problems, the drawing up of new philosophical propositions and general conclusions and with the further development of the theory and method of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. This has always been one of the particularly positive aspects of Leninist tradition in philosophy.

In the early twenties, when discussing the question of the critical assimilation and application by Marxists of the dialectical tradition, Hegel's in particular, and of the solid materialist tradition, Lenin by no means stopped at that. In 1922, in his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", he called for efforts to enrich Marxist philosophical science by analysing the experience of recent history and the revolutionary movement in the West and East and the findings of modern science so as to find answers to the questions posed by rapid social and scientific progress. Unless Marxists adopt this resourceful approach, Lenin concluded, philosophical materialism "can be neither militant nor materialism"* and it will stop being militant and will become defeatable. Lenin emphasised that Marxist philosophers should turn their attention to the scientific discoveries of great reformers of science (Einstein's relativity theory, for instance) so that dialectical materialism, enriched by conclusions drawn from the results of the recent revolution in natural science, could assume a new scientific aspect.

In the latter half of the twenties and in the early thirties, when the question "Who will win?" was being decided in the USSR and socialist society was being constructed in conditions of an intense class struggle and a capitalist encirclement, the Party and its theoreticians had to confront fresh philosophical and social problems connected with the contradictions of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, the contradictions of world development in the modern epoch, the motive forces and objective laws in the development of socialist society, the changes in the structure of society, relations between classes and peoples, the cultural revolution, ideological struggle, and so on.

In the second half of the thirties, when the time had come to uphold and add to the democratic and cultural gains

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 233.

scored in the struggle against fascist reaction, the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and other countries, in accordance with the appeal of the 7th Comintern Congress, launched extensive scientific and ideological work to popularise and develop the progressive traditions in philosophy, social thought and culture.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union repeatedly turned to the problems of the scientific study and the Marxist evaluation of the philosophical heritage of the past. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee on the shortcomings and errors in the interpretation of late eighteenth-century German philosophy (1944) and the philosophical discussion organised by the CPSU Central Committee in 1947 were both devoted to these matters. Yet, the 1947 philosophical debate, which led to an intensification of the struggle against the pressure of bourgeois ideology and its influence after World War II and also of the criticism of bourgeois philosophical concepts and of the errors that had been made in evaluating them, was not then in a position, in the circumstances of the personality cult, to effect a radical improvement in philosophical work including that in the history of philosophy. The debate failed to bring out the immense importance of continuity in the development of philosophical thought, while some of the speakers underestimated the cognitive value of the history of philosophy, especially of the dialectics of German classical philosophy. As a result, at the end of the forties and beginning of the fifties the philosophical heritage of the past was still in a number of cases not being ascribed its true importance.

Nevertheless, it is wrong to allege that in the thirties and forties interest in the problems of the history of philosophy decreased, and that after the 1947 debate the history of philosophy was "called to a halt" in the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, in the thirties and forties, including the period of World War II, philosophical literature in the Soviet Union was enriched by scores of scientific editions of the classics of world philosophy and the philosophical thought of the peoples of the Soviet Union and by numerous monographs and surveys in the field of the history of philosophy, the number of which exceeded many times the philosophical literature put out in the twenties.

Both in the thirties and forties and in the first half of the fifties, Soviet philosophers continued to study the philosophical heritage of the past, and were engaged in the publication of works by Hegel, Feuerbach, French and American enlighteners, Russian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Polish, Yugoslav and other materialists to complete the series already well under way. Although works on the history of philosophy published at that time mostly fell within the category of popular science and propaganda literature and were often one-sided, Soviet scientists nevertheless produced scores of works on the history of world and Russian philosophical and sociological thought in that period as well.*

Works by Soviet philosophers, like that by I. K. Luppol's on Diderot, V. P. Volgin's on the utopian socialists and a number of works on Hegel came to provide an inspiring example of scientific investigation into the materialist and dialectical traditions of French, German and other progressive thinkers for Marxists abroad. Publication in the Soviet Union of scientific and annotated editions of classics of an-

* See G. Aleksandrov, *Aristotle*, Moscow, 1940; V. Asmus, *Marx and Bourgeois Historism*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1938; B. Bykhovsky, *Hegel's Method and System*, Moscow, 1941; B. Bykhovsky, *Philosophy of Descartes*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1940; G. Vasetsky and M. Iovchuk, *On the History of Russian Materialism of the 18th-19th Centuries*, Moscow, 1942; V. Volgin, *Development of Social Thought in France in the 18th Century*, Moscow, 1958; V. Volgin, *French Utopian Communism*, Moscow, 1960; M. Gukovsky, *Mechanics of Leonardo da Vinci*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947; G. Guseinov, *On the History of Social and Philosophic Thought in Azerbaijan in the 19th Century*, Baku, 1958; *From the History of Russian Philosophy*, Selection of articles, Moscow, 1951; B. Kedrov, *Engels and Science*, Moscow, 1947; I. Luppol, *Historico-Philosophic Sketches*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935; A. Makovelsky, *Ancient Greek Atomists*, Baku, 1946; Kh. Momjan, *Lafargue and Some Questions of Marxist Philosophy*, Yerevan, 1954; Kh. Momjan, *The Philosophy of Helvétius*, Moscow, 1955; I. Narsky, *The World Outlook of E. Dembovsky*, Moscow, 1954; T. Oizerman, *The Development of Marxist Theory on the Basis of the Experience of the 1848 Revolutions*, Moscow, 1955; M. Ome-lyanovsky, *U. I. Lenin and the Science of Physics in the 20th Century*, Moscow, 1947; *On the History of Philosophic and Socio-Political Thought in the Soviet Union*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1955-56; G. Plekhanov, *K. A. Timiryazev*, Moscow 1955; Y. Radul-Zatulovsky, *Confucianism and Its Dissemination in Japan*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947; M. Serebryakov, *Frederick Engels*, Leningrad, 1958; E. Sitkovsky, *The Philosophy of J. Robinet*, Moscow, 1936; D. Chesnokov, *Herzen's World Outlook*, Moscow, 1948; etc (All in Russian)

cient, medieval and recent philosophy for the first time provided a Marxist scientific foundation for both the study and popularisation of the philosophical heritage of the past and of the finest intellectual traditions of many different peoples.

It was precisely in the Soviet Union that the study of the philosophical heritage of Eastern peoples (those of India, China, Japan, Iran, the Arab countries, Central Asia, and so on) was put on a scientific basis for the first time. Soviet Marxists (N. I. Konrad, A. O. Makovelsky, Y. B. Radul-Zatulovsky, A. A. Petrov, S. L. Tikhvinsky, S. N. Grigoryan and others) unlike bourgeois historians of colonialist sympathies demonstrated that Eastern philosophical and social thought was not merely contemplative and idealistic, that it was not stagnant and unproductive, that it did not rest solely on intuition and mysticism, but that its development was the fruit of the struggle of progressive, materialist and freedom-loving trends against the domination of reaction, religion and idealism.*

Soviet historians and philosophers have also made an important contribution to the study of the philosophical heritage of East European peoples, which, like the philosophy of the peoples of Asia and Africa, was formerly ignored by bourgeois philosophers and historians. Soviet scientists (such as I. S. Narsky, L. S. Vorobyov, Y. V. Osipova, M. A. Heveshi) were among the first Marxists to study the finest traditions of philosophical thought in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary and other East European countries.**

The Soviet Marxists, who are deeply convinced that Leninism is a new, higher stage in the development of Marxism and its philosophy were nevertheless among the first (for

* *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Moscow, 1957-65; N. Konrad, *The West and the East*, Moscow, 1966; A. Makovelsky, *Avesta*, Baku, 1960; A. Petrov, *Van Bhi*, 226-249. *From the History of Chinese Philosophy*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936; A. Petrov, *Van Chun*, the *Ancient Chinese Materialist and Enlightener*, Moscow, 1954; S. Tikhvinsky, *Struggle for Reforms in China at the End of the 19th Century and Kan Yu-vai*, Moscow, 1959; etc. (All in Russian.)

** *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Vol. 4-6, Moscow, 1959-65; L. Vorobyov, *Luben Karavelov's World Outlook and Creative Work*, Moscow, 1963; L. Vorobyov, *Khristo Botev*, Moscow, 1953; *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965; etc. (All in Russian.)

instance P. Dauge, A. P. Gagarin, Kh. N. Momjan, B. A. Chagin, to launch scientific studies of the legacy of outstanding foreign exponents of Marxist philosophy and social thought who had not yet adopted a Leninist stand, viz., J. Dietzgen and Paul Lafargue, as well as Franz Mehring and other Left-wing Social-Democrats.*

Soviet Marxists resolutely criticised Social-Democrat theoreticians (Karl Kautsky, Otto Bauer and others) for their having renounced the revolutionary principles of Marxism and openly rejected Marxist materialism and dialectics which they replaced by an idealist interpretation of history and by vulgar evolutionism. This criticism—especially in the thirties—was not devoid of errors and exaggerations, due to the fact that Social-Democracy was incorrectly assessed as social-fascism and also to a sweeping, indiscriminate approach to different trends and exponents of non-communist thought in the labour and national liberation movements. On the whole, however, criticism of the Second International's social-opportunism in politics and revisionism in theory, and also in philosophy, made it clear to readers both in the Soviet Union and abroad that from an ideological and theoretical point of view Leninism is the only true and scientific revolutionary doctrine of the modern epoch.

The ideological struggle conducted by the Marxist-Leninist theoreticians in the Soviet Union against reactionary bourgeois ideology and criticism by Soviet Marxists of diverse trends in modern bourgeois philosophy have been of great international significance to Soviet philosophical and social thought and progressive philosophical and social thought abroad. The works of Communist Party leaders and a number of Soviet philosophers published before and during World War II (works by G. F. Aleksandrov, M. A. Arzhanov, B. E. Bykhovsky, S. Y. Volfson, A. M. Deborin, L. F. Ilyichev, F. V. Konstantinov, M. B. Mitin, M. M. Rosental, P. N. Fedoseyev, P. F. Yudin, Y. M. Yaroslavsky and others),

* V. Volkova, *Joseph Dietzgen*, Moscow, 1961; A. Gagarin, *Franz Mehring and His Philosophic Views*, Moscow, 1937; P. Dauge, *Dietzgen*, Moscow, 1934; Kh. Momjan, *Lafargue and Some Questions of Marxist Theory*, Yerevan, 1954; B. Chagin, *From the History of Struggle Against Philosophic Revisionism in the Ranks of German Social-Democracy, 1895-1914*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1961; etc (All in Russian)

which subjected to stern criticism fascist ideology and the reactionary philosophical and sociological concepts used in its support, contributed to the ideological, moral and political defeat of fascism.

Works by Soviet philosophers treating the history of modern philosophy and criticising modern bourgeois philosophy, especially those published in the late fifties, have been of great scientific, ideological and political significance for the development of international Marxist philosophical and social thought and for the ideological struggle against anti-communism and reactionary bourgeois ideology. Of particular note are various collective works on subjective idealism, modern positivism, existentialism, religious-philosophical currents, objective idealism and other trends of modern bourgeois philosophy as well as monographs by a number of Soviet scientists (including Y. P. Frantsev, K. S. Bakradze, A. S. Bogomolov, A. G. Yegorov, Y. A. Zamoshkin, G. A. Kursanov, Y. K. Melvil, V. V. Mshvenieradze, I. S. Narsky, S. F. Oduyev, T. I. Oizerman, A. F. Okulov, S. I. Popov, V. S. Semyonov, Y. N. Semyonov, L. V. Skvortsov, A. F. Shishkin, S. A. Efirov, M. V. Yakovlev).

The principle of proletarian internationalism in the development of Marxist philosophy and social thought in the USSR is also embodied in collective projects, in which Marxists of different countries participate, aimed at elaborating a common philosophical scientific theory.

For over half a century now Soviet philosophers and social scientists have been bringing out works and textbooks which familiarise Communists and other progressives abroad with Marxist theory and promote their Marxist-Leninist grounding. On the other hand, the development of philosophical thought in the Soviet Union has been actively promoted by works of modern Marxist philosophers in other countries, including T. Pavlov and S. Ganovsky (Bulgaria), L. Rudas and B. Fogarasi (Hungary) and others who have taken a direct part in philosophical research conducted in the Soviet Union.

In the current epoch, particularly during the quarter of a century that has passed since a number of other countries embarked on a socialist path and a world socialist system was formed, Marxist philosophical and social thought has

been developing in the context of ideological interaction of Marxists from different countries, thanks to their joint efforts. This has been reflected in the joint documents of the international workers' movement and some collective works prepared by Marxists from different countries (the most recent examples are associated with the centenary of the First International, the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution, the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth, the 50th anniversary of the Communist International and the Lenin centenary). Philosophy and social science in the USSR by no means pretend to any monopoly or universality in solving the theoretical problems of the present. Soviet Marxists attentively study and systematise the results of the development of Marxist philosophy and social thought, often collaborating in the theoretical field with Marxists from other countries. In keeping with Leninist tradition the Communist Party of the Soviet Union furthers in its documents the internationalist line of the development of Marxist social thought. The Theses of the CC CPSU on the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which graphically express the attitude of Soviet Communists and the entire Soviet people on this subject, state: "Possessing a wealth of theory and having accumulated unprecedented experience of applying it in revolutionary struggle and in building a new society, our Party highly assesses the achievements of Marxist-Leninist thought in other countries. It takes them into account and uses them in its theoretical and practical work, in the struggle for socialism and communism."²

² *50th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 41-42.

CHAPTER V

LENINIST PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE CURRENT IDEOLOGICAL BATTLE

The Appeal of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (Moscow, June 1969) entitled "On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" states: "Today we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said about Marxism: it is all-powerful, because it is true. Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in specific conditions permit scientific answers to be found to the questions facing all contingents of the world revolutionary movement, wherever they are active."^{*}

This profound conclusion drawn by an international forum of Communists applies in every respect to the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in various countries of the modern world.

1. THE DISSEMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST-LENINIST IDEAS OUTSIDE THE SOVIET UNION SINCE 1917

In the years immediately after the October Revolution Marxist ideas developed by Lenin and his followers were taken up to an ever-increasing extent by the Communist parties then being set up in countries outside the Soviet Union. The Communist International, set up in 1919, played an important role in the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas and their application to the conditions obtaining in the new epoch, that of the collapse of imperialism under pressure from

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague 1969, p. 41.*

socialist and national liberation revolutions. From the very outset of that period a tremendous influence was exerted on the formation of philosophical thought in the international communist movement by Lenin's works, particularly translations of such classic writings as *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and *The State and Revolution*. A comparable influence in this sphere can also be ascribed to the works of various Soviet Marxists, in particular articles in the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism* which was translated into German and other foreign languages, the philosophical debates held in the twenties and early thirties, Soviet textbooks and manuals on dialectical and historical materialism, etc.

The ideological, theoretical and political struggle which was being waged against Menshevism, "Left communist" and anarcho-syndicalist trends, Trotskyism and Zinovievism, Right-wing opportunism and bourgeois-nationalist deviations by Soviet Communists met with responsive support from the Communist parties that had been set up by that time in many countries of Europe, Asia and elsewhere.

In *Germany* the experience gleaned by Soviet Communists in their ideological and theoretical activities helped German Communists to expose the Social-Reformists' falsifications of Marxist philosophy and also those perpetrated by Trotskyites and other opportunists in the CPG (August Thalheimer, Karl Korsch, etc.) who denied that Lenin's ideas and principles were applicable to countries where capitalism was already highly developed, such as Germany, and who considered their views more "Left" than Leninism itself. German Marxist philosophers (Franz Mehring who died in 1919 and later Hermann Duncker et al.) shed light in their works on the scientific character and lasting relevance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Duncker and other German Marxists criticised Kautsky and his following and Adler's "ethical socialism" and came out against the misguided concept of dialectics as something only applicable to socio-historical reality but not to the world as a whole (this concept was formulated in Lukács' book *History and Class Consciousness*).*

* K Marx's "*Capital*" and *Philosophy Today*, Moscow, 1968, pp 521-24 (in Russian).

Giving voice to the general line followed by the CPG headed by Ernst Thälmann, with regard to the continuation and development of Leninist theoretical and political traditions Duncker wrote: "Thanks to the work of V. I. Lenin revolutionary Marxism again raised its leonine head, shedding the skin of Menshevik, social-chauvinist distortions, revisionist and imperialist opportunism and . . . Kautskian misrepresentation. Through his creative development of Marxism Lenin created a political programme of revolutionary communism for the modern world."¹

The split that took place in the labour movement as a result of the efforts by Right-wing Social-Democrats, and the establishment in Germany of a fascist dictatorship in 1933 held back the dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas in that country, but not even the nazi terror could stamp out Marxist thought in the German labour movement.

Significant contributions to the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy have since been made by various Marxist writers from the GDR, who adopted and actively promoted Leninist traditions (Kurt Hager, A. Kosing, Matthäus Klein, Georg Mende, Hermann Ley and others).² In writings and speeches by Marxists in the GDR and also from the FRG (Max Reimann, Josef Schleifstein, Robert Steigerwald and others) and West Berlin, harsh and detailed criticism of bourgeois and reformist ideology was found side by side with convincing demonstrations of the fact that only Leninism provides science-based answers to the central problems of our age.

Soon after the October Revolution leading figures in the Communist Party of France—Maurice Thorez, Marcel Cachin, Jacques Duclos, Waldek Rochet, Georges Cogniot and others—embarked on energetic propaganda and theoretical elaboration of Marxist ideas. This work was also participated in by professional Marxist philosophers—Georges Polit-

¹ H. Duncker, *Introduction into Marxism*, Moscow, 1963, p. 198 (Russ. ed.).

² *Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 453-67, 689-99 (in Russian); *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).

zer, Henri Mougín, Jacques Solomon, Guy Besse, Jean Kana. Lucien Séve and others.*

Fundamental works on the life and work of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were put out by the French Marxist Auguste Cornu. A number of prominent scientists (Paul Langevin, Frédéric Joliot-Curie) adopted a dialectical materialist stand.

While approaching fundamental socio-theoretical and philosophical problems from a Marxist, dialectical-materialist standpoint, the French Communists at the same time continue to figure as heirs to the Enlightenment, materialist, socialist and revolutionary-democratic traditions of their own people. Calling attention to the fact that the communist movement in France traces its origins back to the materialism of the eighteenth-century philosophers, to Babeuf and Cabet, Saint-Simon, Fourier and Blanqui, Maurice Thorez in the name of the Communist Party declared: "It is we alone who carry on the finest traditions in France."**

In Italy Marxist philosophical traditions are inseparably linked with the theoretical and political activities of Antonio Labriola, Antonio Gramsci, Palmiro Togliatti and other revolutionary Marxists. In the years that followed the October Revolution, despite the difficult conditions stemming from the fascist domination of long standing, Marxist traditions were carried forward by the Italian Communist Party that had been founded by Gramsci and Togliatti. The Italian Communists embraced the theory and method of Leninism which they applied to their own local conditions: only following a Leninist course, Togliatti pointed out, was it possible to develop fruitfully Marx's heritage in the twentieth century.

Although in one of his first Marxist works, *Revolution Despite "Capital"*, Gramsci drew the erroneous conclusion to the effect that the October Revolution which he welcomed with enthusiasm did not tie in with Marx's prediction, in a number of subsequent works, as Togliatti was to point out, he achieved a full and comprehensive grasp of Leninist theory

* Marx's *"Capital" and Philosophy Today*, Moscow, 1968, pp 568-87 (in Russian).

** M Thorez, *Oeuvres choisies*, en trois volumes, Vol. II, p. 507.

enabling him to consider in a Leninist spirit questions concerning the motive forces behind revolution, the hegemony of the proletariat, the Party, and the unity of theory and practice. Gramsci subjects to persuasive criticism idealistic philosophy, on the one hand, in particular that of Benedetto Croce, and, on the other, the fatalistic and dogmatic schemata of those theoreticians, who only take into account the action of constant social and economic laws but attach no significance to subjective factors at work in society, and socio-historical experience which play an important role in specific historical situations. The controversial nature of various formulations drawn up by Gramsci such as those with regard to the "totality of practice" give us no grounds for contrasting the Marxist works of Gramsci and Lenin. Works by Togliatti and other Italian Marxists demonstrate that Gramsci's theoretical writings represent a creative attempt to follow Lenin's teaching.

True to the spirit of Lenin's theory and method Togliatti provided a profound Marxist assessment of the traditions which had grown up in Italian and world culture and in the field of social and philosophical thought. He demonstrated that precisely the Marxists were the true heirs and promulgators of the finest traditions of the Renaissance, and also of the progressive trends in European thought of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in particular the philosophy of Hegel. In a spirit quite alien to the non-critical approach to Hegel's idealism to be found among Italian neo-Hegelians, Togliatti outlines the essential critical position adhered to by Marx and his followers in their interpretation of Hegel's philosophy as they adopted the revolutionary content of his dialectic. Togliatti writes: "The task which Marx sets himself is, on the one hand, to single out and elaborate the revolutionary essence of Hegel's ideas... and, on the other, he always quite clearly endeavours to make use of thought patterns evolved by Hegel in order to obtain a clearer grasp of reality and apprehend its development, while often disregarding the speculative, abstract conclusions and deductions."^{*}

^{*} Palmiro Togliatti, "Da Hegel al marxismo", *Rinascita*, Anno XI, No. 6, Roma, Giugno 1954, p. 389.

In Italy Marxist philosophy exerted a fruitful influence on progressive humanist ideas, in particular with regard to research into the history of culture and social thought. An example of this is to be found in Eugenio Garin's works, for example, *Gronache di filosofia italiana (1900-1943)* [*Chronicle of Twentieth-Century Italian Philosophy (1900-1943)*], in which reactionary conceptions of idealism in Italy are criticised (Hegelianism, pragmatism, existentialism, Christian spiritualism, etc) and likewise groundless attempts of their authors to "integrate" their unscientific views with Marx's philosophy which, according to Garin, reflect their endeavour to do away not only with the influence of Lenin's ideas, but also to a considerable degree with those of Marx, an attempt "through a series of various mystifications to find old-style idealism in new texts".*

In recent years Italian Marxist philosophers have been turning their attention increasingly to investigation of their own national Marxist traditions; works by Garin and other Marxists serve this end, dealing with the Marxist ideas of Antonio Labriola, Gramsci's contribution to Marxist-Leninist philosophy (*Leninism in the Thought and Work of Gramsci*, *Gramsci and Leninism* by Togliatti, *Research on Gramsci*, and others) and Togliatti's role in the dissemination and development of Marxism in Italy (Ernesto Raggioneri's *Palmiro Togliatti*, and others).

In the *United States of America* Marxist traditions, represented in this and the last century in the works of Joseph Weydemeyer, Friedrich Sorge, Joseph Dietzgen, Daniel De Leon, Eugene Debs, William Heywood and others, are being carried forward and developed in the present historical epoch by the US Communist Party headed by Marxist-Leninist theoreticians such as William Foster, Gus Hall.

William Foster stressed that the works of Lenin supplemented by the practical experience of the October Revolution were a decisive factor for the creation of the

* Investigations into the history of contemporary Italian philosophy, including Marxist philosophy, can be found in the works of S. A. Efimov (See Marx's "*Capital*" and *Philosophy Today*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 605-27, in Russian) and in *Leninism and Modern Problems of Historic-Philosophic Science*, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian).

theoretical basis of the Communist Party of the United States.*

In a number of his theoretical works (*The Twilight of World Capitalism, Outline Political History of the Americas*, etc.) Foster demonstrated that the United States was by no means a case all its own and Marxist teaching with regard to universal laws of social development, including that under present-day capitalism, applied in full degree to his country as well. He wrote: "American capitalism is fundamentally the same economic and political system as capitalism in other countries, and it is a prey to basically the same internal and external contradictions."***

In works by Foster, Gus Hall, Herbert Aptheker and other American Communists, written from a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, biased racist theories put forward by ideologists of American imperialism* and also revisionist conceptions propagated by Browder, Gates and Bittelman and other renegade Marxists who have taken up the idea of "American exclusiveness", etc., are subjected to scathing criticism.

A number of Marxist philosophers in the US (such as Harry Wells, Howard Selsam, Victor Jerome, D. Stroik, S. Filkenstein) have provided scientific critical analyses of "modern" trends in American bourgeois philosophy (Dewey's pragmatism, Sidney Hook's attempts to falsify Marxism, neo-Freudian, bourgeois philosophical anthropology with its idealistic interpretation of Marx's early works, existentialism with its insistence on the immutable nature of alienation, etc.)***

The international significance of dialectical materialism is also recognised by the leading representatives of the progressive intelligentsia (Barrows Dunham, Paul K. Crosser, Corliss Lamont, John Somerville, Roy Wood Sellars, et al.) whose works acquaint the American public with the problems and achievements of Marxist philosophy including those relevant to the Soviet Union.

*W. Foster, *October Revolution and the United States of America*, Moscow, 1958, p. 35 (Russ. ed.)

** W. Foster, *The Twilight of World Capitalism* New York, 1949, p. 30.

*** Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today, Moscow, 1965, pp. 635-48.

Eastern Europe. The fact that after World War II the countries of Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) embarked on the socialist path, despite the fact that in many of these countries a fascist dictatorship had held sway for many years and Communist parties had been subjected to monstrous persecution and thus obliged to go underground, should to a large measure be ascribed to the powerful attraction of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, to the ideological and political influence of the Great October Revolution and the triumphs of socialist construction in the USSR. Marxist-Leninist ideas won over the minds of the progressive men and women in the working class and intelligentsia despite all manner of bans and persecution. Unswerving fraternal help afforded by Soviet Communists promoted the ideological and political grounding and steeling of party personnel, including theoreticians, in these countries, the translation and dissemination of Marxist literature, scientific research and theoretical activities engaged in by Marxists of those countries, including Marxist philosophers.*

Communist parties (in Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and other countries of Eastern Europe) made skilful use of all opportunities for legal work that facilitated their dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideas and propagation of the USSR's socialist achievements among the working people, including Soviet achievements in science and culture, so as to bring over to their side and win the support of the finest representatives of the intelligentsia who identified themselves with the people and to help the latter learn the truth about Marxist-Leninist philosophy, socialist culture and socialist science.

In *Bulgaria*, where Marxist traditions, including those in the field of philosophy, were inseparably linked with the activities of the revolutionary workers' party of the *Tesnyaki* headed by *Dmitr Blagoev*, Marxist theory, developed fruit-

* Many prominent Marxist philosophers from Eastern Europe such as *Todor Pavlov*, *Sava Ganovsky*, *R. Karakolov* (Bulgaria), *László Rudas*, *Béla Fogarasi* (Hungary), *Stefan Rudniański* (Poland), *Zdenek Nejedly* (Czechoslovakia) received a Marxist-Leninist training in the USSR, or were engaged in research work in the Soviet Union for a number of years.

fully after 1917 thanks to the unswerving efforts of the Bulgarian Communist Party and its leaders such as Dimitr Blagoev, Georgi Dimitrov, Vasil Kolarov .

Georgi Dimitrov's work in the Comintern and his report delivered to the 7th Comintern Congress (1935) were of profound significance for the theory and practice of the international communist movement in the early forties. Theoretical works put out by Dimitrov and Kolarov played a prominent part in the dissemination of Leninist ideas not only in the labour movement in Bulgaria but also among many other detachments of the world communist movement.

In the difficult years when a monarcho-fascist regime held sway in that country the Bulgarian Communist Party trained experienced and prominent Marxist philosophers (T. Pavlov, S. Ganovsky, G. Bakalov, A. Kiselinchev, P. Genov, M. Dimitrov et al.)

Works published by Bulgaria's Marxist philosophers vividly reflect the struggle waged by Communists throughout the world to uphold the movement's Marxist-Leninist heritage in order to defend and consolidate the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy. Ever since 1927 when Ganovsky brought out his *Lenin and Dialectical Materialism* that deals with these problems, Bulgarian Marxist philosophers have devoted a great deal of their research to the Leninist stage in Marxist philosophy.

A particularly important role in the creative elaboration of the philosophical problems of Leninism can be ascribed to Todor Pavlov's work, *The Theory of Reflection* (1936) providing a profound analysis of the essence of Lenin's theory of reflection. Arguments taken from the findings of contemporary science are used to corroborate the Marxist idea to the effect that "science in general . . . is historical both with regard to form and content, and as such represents true history in its complete form".* Many works of Pavlov's written both before and after the triumph of the Bulgarian socialist revolution in September 1944, are devoted to methodological problems relevant to social and natural sciences, aesthetics and the history of science and culture. In his

T. Pavlov, *The Theory of Reflection*, Moscow, 1949, p. 256 (Russ. ed.)

work, *The Science of Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics. Its Subject, Aims and Method* Pavlov provides the following definition of scientific method as such: "Scientific method is the inner pattern of human thought viewed as the subjective image of the real, objective law of movement, or the objective law 'transplanted' and 'transformed' within human consciousness, which is deliberately used by man to explain and change the world."*

The works of T. Pavlov, G. Bakalov, M. Dimitrov and other Bulgarian Communists laid the foundation for Marxist research into the history of Bulgarian culture and social thought, extended criticism of reactionary philosophical and sociological conceptions (Rehmkeanism, Nietzscheanism, Malthusianism, etc.) which at that time had a wide following in that country.

The writings of S. Ganovsky treating problems connected with the materialist interpretation of history and the history of world philosophy served to popularise the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the achievements of Soviet philosophical science providing well-argued criticism of bourgeois philosophical conceptions utilised for the "substantiation" of fascism and reaction.

The indefatigable and diversified ideological and theoretical activities of the Bulgarian Marxists, among whom philosophers were to play a particularly prominent role, made possible the subsequent adoption by a considerable section of the Bulgarian intelligentsia of a Marxist-Leninist standpoint, even before the revolutionary victory of 1944, and thus provided an important prerequisite for socialist transformations in all spheres of the country's social and cultural life.

After the liberation of Bulgaria from the monarcho-fascist regime as a result of the socialist revolution of September 1944 Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought in Bulgaria was able to develop creatively on the foundation of Marxist-Leninist principles since by then favourable conditions existed for the carrying forward and development of Leninist traditions. The militant journal put out by Bulgarian Marxist

* T. Pavlov, *Selected Philosophic Works*, in four volumes, Vol 4, Moscow, 1963, pp 312-13 (Russ. ed.).

philosophers, *Philosophical Thought*, and the Institute of Philosophy attached to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences played a significant and fruitful role in furthering the development of Leninism in the sphere of philosophy.

In the forties and fifties Marxist thought had already been enriched by a number of fundamental works by Bulgarian philosophers in various spheres of philosophy. Pavlov and other Bulgarian philosophers (such as A. Kiselichev, G. Girginov) successfully elaborated Lenin's theory of reflection taking due account of the findings of modern science (Ivan Pavlov's theory on the higher nervous activity, cybernetics, information theory, symbolic logic, etc.). Important new contributions to the elaboration of Lenin's aesthetic theory of socialist realism were made by Todor Pavlov and other Bulgarian Marxists. Ganovskiy (in his work *Socio-economic Formations and Peaceful Co-existence*), S. Angelov, T. Vylov, P. Gindev, V. Dobriyanov, S. Mikhailov, Z. Oshavkov, N. Stefanov, N. Yakhel and other Bulgarian Marxists carried forward Leninist traditions in the field of the materialist interpretation of history and brought out works on topical aspects of contemporary social development (problems of peaceful co-existence, the struggle between two social systems, the role of the subjective factor, problems of humanism, methodological foundations of sociology, etc.). N. Iribadzhakov (in his *Contemporary Critics of Marxism*), D. Pavlov and N. Trendafilov (in their *Ideological Poverty of Anti-Communism*) and other Bulgarian philosophers successfully applied Leninist principles to criticism of bourgeois philosophy in the ideological struggle against contemporary anti-communism and revisionism.

Leninist traditions in the history of philosophy were carried forward in research into the history of Bulgarian and world philosophy carried out by S. Ganovskiy, M. Dimitrov, R. Karakolov, A. Bynkov, M. Bychvarov and other Bulgarian Marxists.

Ever since the twenties Bulgarian Marxist philosophers have attributed particular importance to defending Leninist traditions and to elaborating problems connected with the Leninist stage of Marxist philosophy. This came particularly vividly to the fore in, among other works, a joint Bulgarian-Soviet publication, edited by Todor Pavlov, *The Leninist*

Theory of Reflection and the Modern World, put out on the occasion of the Lenin Centenary.

Bulgarian Marxist philosophers who adhere loyally to Leninist principles and continue and develop Leninist traditions in philosophy have provided models of the creative approach to topical problems in the field of philosophy and also of indefatigable ideological struggle against the enemies of communism.

In Hungary prior to the end of the First World War and the revolution of 1919 Marxist traditions in the sphere of philosophy had had virtually no scope for development. The translation and publications of a number of works by Marx, Engels and Lenin after the revolution played an important part in the Marxist training of Hungary's Communists, in their ideological struggle against the theories put forward by the reactionary bourgeoisie and landowning class, against social-reformism, "Austro-Marxism" and other opportunist trends.

Hungarian Marxists Béla Kun, E. Varga and others actively propagated the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and attempted to apply its principles and dialectical method to their analysis of political and economic process in post-war capitalism and also that of the strategy and tactics of the Hungarian and international labour movement.

Georg Lukács, one of the leading philosophers of our times (in such works as *History and Class Consciousness* (1923), *History of Realism* (1939), *Young Hegel...* (1948), *The Annihilation of Reason...* (1954), *Aesthetics* (1963), et al.) undertook original attempts at philosophical analysis of bourgeois consciousness in the modern age, in particular of the irrationalist tendencies to be observed in bourgeois philosophy and decadent art, and also at investigating the philosophical and aesthetic theories of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The philosophical writings of Georg Lukács have gone down in the history of contemporary philosophy despite the controversial and at times even erroneous nature of certain of his propositions. Lukács' book *History and Class Consciousness* was subjected to criticism in works by Hermann Duncker, A. Deborin, László Rudas and other Marxist philosophers: indeed Lukács himself criticised his former views as

early as 1934 at a conference of the Communist Academy in Moscow devoted to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

Lukacs' works make it clear that after making the transition from non-Marxist ideas to Marxist philosophy and coming to adopt its basic tenets and attempt to elaborate them in the complex conditions of post-war developments and the struggle against fascism, nevertheless he failed to adopt a consistent Leninist approach to social and philosophical questions of the modern age and as a result, particularly in 1956, committed a number of revisionist errors in the sphere of both philosophy and politics.

Yet, despite the complexity and contradictory nature of Lukacs' ideological and theoretical development, it would be wrong to evaluate his place in the history of philosophy of our age in an oversimplified, negative way. In the ideological and theoretical struggle waged by the communist movement against fascism and reactionary currents in bourgeois philosophy, particularly the irrationalist ones, against dogmatic and vulgarising nihilism in relation to the classic works of our philosophical and artistic heritage, in the campaign to win over representatives of "critical realism" and other progressive figures from the world of bourgeois culture to the side of anti-imperialist forces, in their time Lukacs' writings have played and continue to play now a distinctly positive role.

Prominent Hungarian Marxist philosophers such as László Rudas, Erik Molnar, Béla Fogarasi and Pal Sandor have played an active role in the propaganda of Marxist philosophy and in the elaboration of its contemporary aspects from a Leninist standpoint.*

Thorough Marxist research into the history of Hungarian and world philosophy and criticism of modern bourgeois philosophy is to be found in works by L. Matrai, Pal Sandor, Y. Szigeti, F. Tokei, A. Gedö, D. Fukas, A. Kiss, A. Virtand and other Hungarian philosophers. A number of these works contain Leninist criticism of idealistic philosophical conceptions of past and present, in particular Hungarian

* See *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).

bourgeois concepts. "*Geistesgeschichte*" and both Right- and "Left"-wing philosophical revisionism.*

The history of Marxist philosophy in Hungary after the country's liberation from fascism shows how in an extremely short historical period and at a difficult time, when reactionary and social-reformist traditions in philosophy were having to be surmounted, and an acute struggle was being waged against dogmatic and revisionist influences Hungarian philosophers were able successfully to assimilate Marxist-Leninist philosophical traditions and enrich philosophical science with writings of considerable value.** This outline of the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and the historical fact of the dissemination and development of Marxist philosophy in other countries of Eastern Europe since the October Revolution in Russia and up until the present stage of historical development (the 1960s and 1970s) testify that Leninism in our historical epoch has taken firm root in the international communist movement and also in the philosophical thought and progressive science of many countries.

2. CERTAIN ASPECTS

OF MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY IN OTHER COUNTRIES AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT (THE 1960s)

The present stage of historical development is characterised by an activation of the forces of world socialism, the growth of its international authority and the continued development of Marxist-Leninist theory, including philosophical theory. At the same time the present period in international development is also characterised by an increasingly intense struggle between the systems of socialism and imperialism, an ever more persistent ideological campaign to uphold Leninism in the labour movement and the liberation movement as a whole, an active campaign to

* *Problems of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*, articles of Hungarian authors, Moscow, 1965, Russ. ed.; A. Gedő, "*Marxism and Bankruptcy of Bourgeois Ideology*", *Filosofskiye nauki*, 1965, No. 5; *Leninism and Modern Problems of Historico-Philosophic Science*, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian)

** An analysis of the development of Marxist philosophy in Hungary after 1919 is found in the works of A. Kiss, Pal Sandor, M. Heveshi and other historians of philosophy.

surmount the problems and contradictions in the international communist movement, and promote the victory of Marxism-Leninism over "centrifugal" tendencies constituting revisionist deviations from its principles.

At the international Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969 Leonid Brezhnev analysed the existing state of affairs, called attention to the problems and differences of opinion within the international communist movement and the reasons for them, indicating the harm dealt to that movement by revisionist trends of either a Right- or "Left"-wing nature.

At the same time Leonid Brezhnev also pointed to the need to wage a struggle to consolidate the unity of the international communist movement and to resolve existing differences with the help of Marxist-Leninist principles. He noted that one of the most important trends in this struggle was the synthesising of theoretical work undertaken by the various Communist and Workers' parties, the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and the championing of its principles and fundamental ideas and he recalled that Lenin had stressed the vital need for a theoretical assessment of new forms of struggle called forth by the exigencies of practice.

In the Main Document issued at the end of the Meeting it is stated: "the Communist and Workers' Parties are conducting their activity in diverse, specific conditions, requiring an appropriate approach to the solution of concrete problems. Each Party, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping with concrete national conditions, fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle, and, depending on the circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country. At the same time, the diverse conditions in which the Communist Parties operate, the different approaches to practical tasks and even differences on certain questions must not hinder concerted international action by fraternal Parties, particularly on the basic problems of the anti-imperialist struggle."^{*}

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Prague 1969, p. 37*

This Document also drew attention to the fact that in order to secure success in their struggle Communist and Workers' parties must consistently uphold Marxist-Leninist principles, combat Right- and "Left"-wing opportunist distortions of Marxist theory and politics and also combat revisionism, dogmatism and all manner of "Left" extremists.

The development of Marxist theory, including philosophical theory, does not proceed evenly, trends discernible in different countries sometimes have little in common and can even conflict with each other. It is unthinkable that the development of theory, including philosophical theory, in various countries should correspond or coincide completely with the development of philosophical and theoretical advances made in the USSR, since the conditions in which the socialist revolution is developing differ, and likewise the traditions and specific features peculiar to the individual countries, to such an extent that here, perhaps more than in any other sphere of social life, there is no place for unification and complete identity. Indeed Lenin over fifty years ago (in his article "'Left-wing' Childishness and the Petty-bourgeois Mentality") foretold that in the international advance to socialism "there will always be a 'discrepancy', that it always exists in the development of nature as well as in the development of society, that only by a series of attempts—each of which, taken by itself, will be one-sided, and will suffer from certain inconsistencies—will complete socialism be created by the revolutionary co-operation of the proletarians of *all* countries".*

What accounts for the various searchings for new solutions to philosophical and other theoretical problems in our times, searchings which often lead to conclusions and propositions different from those provided earlier in Marxist philosophical literature?

This situation can be explained first and foremost by the specific features of the socio-historical and theoretical development to be observed at the present period, including those relating to countries which have embarked on the socialist road and where there is a keen awareness of inadequacies

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 346

in the elaboration of a number of theoretical problems, particularly topical philosophical and sociological problems.

What do these specific features relating to the present stage of development in the international communist movement consist in?

1. Progress towards socialism in a number of European countries is proceeding in conditions unlike those pertaining during the construction of socialism in the USSR (the feasibility in these countries of a relatively peaceful transition to socialism, the specific conditions pertaining to the progress toward socialism in highly developed industrial countries against a background of the technological revolution, the active support and all-round aid afforded by the Soviet Union and other countries of the world socialist system, the existence of a number of political parties in the framework of a national front, etc.).

2. The existence of a past history, national and cultural traditions different from those once found in the USSR in a number of European countries that have recently embarked on the socialist road (Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) and still more so in the socialist countries of Asia. At a time when rapid advances are being made with regard to the formation of social awareness in some of these countries strong influence of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, nationalist, reformist, religious ideas and various others quite alien to socialism makes itself felt, and inadequate development of Marxist philosophical traditions is also to be observed, etc. In Poland, for example, philosophy developed in complex and contradictory conditions resulting from the influence of Catholic philosophy, the Lvov-Warsaw school and other positivist trends in Polish philosophy, requiring a critical approach to their trends of scientific logic and atheism and the surmounting of the idealistic aspects of these tendencies, etc.

3. Specific features of contemporary development which came to the fore in the mid-fifties also find expression in the ideological and theoretical differences within the communist movement, including those in the philosophical field.

The Communist parties of the USSR and a number of other countries on their own initiative resolutely did away with the cult of personality and its consequences in a short

space of time. However the spread of the personality cult in some socialist countries and its consequences unfavourable to the development of theory led to major problems for the international communist movement.

Making capital out of the personality cult and its consequences anti-socialist and revisionist elements started casting doubts upon the continuity of Leninist traditions and the relevance of Soviet experience in contemporary conditions to other countries, maintaining that in highly developed industrial countries of Europe a "different brand" of Marxism is required, "Western Marxism", "socialism with a human face", and that for countries which have recently broken free of colonial dependence special "eastern varieties" of Marxism are required.

4. Special features of the development of Marxist philosophy in the sixties can also be explained by considerable changes that took place in the character of bourgeois ideology recently. Many currents of bourgeois philosophy now go in not for a direct negation of Marxism, but rather attempt to "combine" or "integrate" bourgeois attitudes with arbitrarily interpreted Marxist propositions, to "tone down" or "up-date" Marxism, i.e., to use Lenin's words, they endeavour to strangle Marxism by a soft approach, by a fatal embrace. Apart from these reactionary pretensions exhibited by various bourgeois ideologists anxious at all costs to undermine the international authority and ideological influence of Marxism, another factor characteristic of the present period is the tremendous intensification of interest shown in Marxism not only by the working class but also by the intelligentsia, students, left sections of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, by the revolutionary democratic forces in the countries of the Third World, etc.

A vacuum in the sphere of philosophy and social thought is impossible. The approach to Marxist ideas differs substantially at the present time from what it was in the thirties and forties and is by no means uniform nowadays: it is sometimes creative, facilitating a rejection of dogmatism and active struggle against bourgeois ideology and revisionism. However there also exist other "approaches" to Marxism—through the prism of bourgeois-nationalist, petty-bourgeois, pseudo-revolutionary and other ideas typical of various so-

cial forces which are being drawn into the contemporary revolutionary process. The interest shown by these social forces in individual tenets of Marxism and Marxist philosophy often goes hand in hand with attempts to "integrate" them with bourgeois and petty-bourgeois philosophical and political ideas, to extend to Marxist philosophy "principles" of bourgeois philosophy (pluralism, "deideologisation", "abstract humanism", etc.). This at times leads to an infiltration of Marxist thought by bourgeois ideology, to open or veiled statements by certain theoreticians, calling themselves Marxists, against Leninist theoretical and in particular philosophical principles and against the Leninist policy pursued by the international communist movement.

5. A special feature of the present stage of development in Marxist philosophy outside the Soviet Union is the keenly felt need to resolve the contradictions and differences in that philosophy with regard to a number of topical questions of theory and practice through elaboration of various complex philosophical problems which have as yet been insufficiently studied and in many respects have yet to be solved.

Important topical questions which have as yet been inadequately studied in the light of Leninist philosophical traditions include:

1) problems of the dialectics of modern social progress towards socialism (unity of general laws pertaining to this progress and its special features to be observed in various countries);

2) questions connected with the modern technological revolution and in connection with it changes in social relations and systems and methods of social management;

3) humanistic problems (man as an individual, his freedoms and responsibilities, his purpose in life, etc.);

4) the question of the structure, subject-matter and functions of Marxist philosophy, and that of the importance of practice in relation to philosophy;

5) the correlation between dialectics as a universal, scientific-philosophical method and specific scientific methods;

6) the relation of Marxism to bourgeois philosophy and other non-Marxist ideological trends in the modern world;

7) questions connected with the history of Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy, the prospects for its development in the future.

There exist of course other extremely important questions which could be and indeed are being solved by Marxist philosophy on the basis of Leninist principles and traditions. These include philosophical problems connected with social management; social forecasting; the development of society's intellectual life and the question of man's cultural heritage, the philosophical heritage of the past and the investigation of the objective laws to be discerned in the historico-philosophical process; Marxism and modern trends in religion; theoretical problems linked with the development of national relations and the ideology formulated by national liberation movements; philosophical problems raised by developments in natural science and the logic of scientific thought, etc.

Philosophical Problems of Modern Social Development and the Transition to Socialism and Communism

In the USSR, as Leonid Brezhnev pointed out in his report, *Fifty Years of Great Achievements of Socialism*, a developed socialist society has been built.*

The final and conclusive victory of socialism in the USSR and the construction of the foundations of socialism in a number of European countries in the fifties and early sixties confronted philosophers and sociologists with new questions concerning the laws pertaining to socialist development and the prospects for its future, concerning the diversity of its forms and the resolution of the contradictions in this process on a national and international scale, the dialectics of the universal and the particular in socialist development, etc.

A question of prime importance in this context is that of socialist development. Marxists often raise the question as to whether the contemporary development in some socialist countries outside the Soviet Union represents a direct transition to communism or whether any other stages are required before the transition to communism such as the construction of a highly organised socialist society, the finishing touches

* L. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, 1972, p. 15.

and completion of the socialist stage of the new socio-economic formation, etc. Is the conclusive triumph of socialist production relations sufficient for the establishment of the socialist formation or is a whole series of other conditions also required?

A number of contemporary Marxists support the dialectical combination of a number of conditions in relation to the socialist formation and hold that in order to create the necessary prerequisites for the transition to communism it is essential to raise socialist society to a new higher stage and build a developed socialist system with specific economic, technological, social, cultural and ideological characteristics.

The essential preconditions of socialist society in the opinion of many Marxists of today, apart from the main one—the triumph of socialist production relations—are: the dove-tailing of the socialist economic system with the achievements of the technological revolution ensuring high productivity of socialist labour and a radical change in the nature of labour; a gradual obliteration of the distinctions between manual and brainworkers; the achievement of a high level of material prosperity; scientific organisation of production and social management; the promotion of socialist democracy and the elimination of bureaucratic anachronisms and distortions; the flowering of socialist culture and the all-round development of the personality, etc. For this reason the results achieved in the sphere of socialist development in the socialist countries in Europe are considered by the Marxists of those countries as insufficient for the final establishment of the socialist formation. They hold that a good deal of effort is still required to create and consolidate a highly developed socialist society, which is also referred to as “completion of the construction of the foundations of socialism” or “comprehensive construction of socialism”, etc. An erroneous idea was put forward to the effect that socialism and highly developed socialist society (which also constitutes the first step in the gradual transition to communism) is a social formation relatively independent of communism.

Marxist philosophers in the socialist countries pay special attention to the elaboration of the Marxist revolutionary-critical method, namely dialectics, and its application to the conditions obtaining under socialism. Doing away with the

former one-sided, non-dialectical conception of "complete correspondence" and the "conflict-free" nature of socialist development many Marxist philosophers outside the Soviet Union are calling for a scientific and critical approach to the achievements in socialist development already at hand and come out against the former one-sided "black-and-white" approach to these achievements. In this context the writings of various German, Bulgarian and other Marxist philosophers on the dialectics of the development of socialist society are of considerable interest. Philosophers and other Marxists abroad have also made various attempts to formulate a philosophical interpretation of the economic reforms that have been recently introduced in the European socialist countries.

Serious distortions of Marxism have taken place in writings on this subject, in particular those by a number of Yugoslav philosophers contributing to the journal *Praxis* and various Czech philosophers, such as Július Strinka. They came out with false assertions to the effect that socialism, like capitalism, requires "limitless negation", demands revolutionary "negation" and a synthesis with the achievements of "Western industrial society", which would make possible the creation of a new society incorporating the "best" in capitalism and socialism. Certain philosophers, sociologists and economists, such as the bourgeois reformist Ota Šik from Czechoslovakia, disregarding Marxist principles of the class approach to social phenomena, advocated an interpretation of economic reform, which was tantamount to a rejection of the socialist economy and a reshaping of the economic development of the socialist countries to meet the requirements of a market system and the capitalist economy and a questioning of the desirability of the very existence of a dictatorship of the working class, etc.

Some Marxist theoreticians outside the Soviet Union made the error of interpreting the economic reforms recently introduced in the socialist countries as a departure from socialism and a slipping back to bourgeois market relations.

On the other hand, Marxist philosophers and sociologists from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia and other countries draw the conclusion that these economic reforms represent a qualitatively new stage

in the development of socialist economy at a time when its most important advantages are making themselves increasingly felt thanks to the economy's modern technological foundation and the consistent application of socialist material and moral incentives.

One of the most important prerequisites for the development of the socialist formation is the consistent implementation of the technological revolution without which at the present stage of social development it would be impossible either to create the material and technical basis of communism or to develop the socialist economic system at all. Questions connected with the technological revolution of today are being investigated by philosophers in the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and a number of other socialist countries.

Some burning theoretical questions raised by Richta and other philosophers from Czechoslovakia have not yet been comprehensively investigated and the propositions put forward are controversial and in certain cases are erroneous and call for further debate. The most important factor which was overlooked by the contributors concerned was the need to investigate in detail the principal differences between the social consequences of the technological revolution under socialism and capitalism respectively.

In certain socialist countries (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland) erroneous points of view have been put forward in works by philosophers and sociologists to the effect that the technological revolution, in all conditions, intensifies alienation of the individual from the results of his labour and from civilisation and leads to the emergence of an all-powerful "technocracy". Technical and scientific progress and the introduction of innovations made possible by science into all spheres of social life are incorrectly assessed in some publications, in particular the Zagreb journal *Praxis*, as something basically inhumane, conflicting with the integrated equilibrium of the individual and his emotional experience.

Rudi Supek, for example, in his article *Technocratic Scientism and Socialist Humanism* published in the journal *Praxis* maintains that technological progress, even under socialism, leads to suppression of personality, to its disintegration by the machine system and the "all-powerful technocracy".

Some philosophers, sociologists and economists in Czechoslovakia, particularly in 1969, have been indulging in metaphysical extremism and vastly exaggerating the shortcomings and problems in the life of society in the socialist countries under conditions of industrial development, departing from a class assessment of the social consequences of the technological revolution of today and starting to advocate a humane model for socialism, "socialism with a human face", etc., which in fact turned out to be nothing other than a bourgeois-liberal rejection of scientific socialism, the dictatorship of the working class, the historical experience of the USSR and the world socialist system. Flaunting this slogan calling for the creation of just such a "new model of socialism" revisionist elements denigrated all achievements in socialist development scored by Czechoslovakia and the other socialist countries and attempted to wrest Czechoslovakia away from the world socialist system. They maintained that economic reform should make possible a fundamental change in the country's political structure facilitating the creation of a "Western" type of socialism with a "viable" economy, similar to that in the industrially developed countries of the capitalist world and with a "free interplay" of political forces. They denied the right of the working class and the Communist Party to a leading role in society. These anti-Leninist views propagated by Ota Šik, Milan Huebl, Ivan Sviták, Karl Kósik and similar Right-wing anti-socialist elements met with firm opposition from Czechoslovak Communists who remained loyal to Leninist principles and the Communist Parties and peoples of the fraternal socialist countries. The bourgeois-liberal anti-socialist concepts of "integration" of socialism and capitalism, of the Marxist and bourgeois world outlook, disguised as "humane socialism" were exposed and the mistakes committed by certain Czechoslovak Marxist philosophers and sociologists were subjected to telling criticism.

In the course of the intense political and theoretical debate going on at that time Marxist philosophers came out with criticism of erroneous views of the position of the individual in conditions of the technological revolution, which were voiced, for instance, at the conference "Man and Society in the Conditions of the Technological Revolution" held

in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in articles treating the "new Czech model for socialism" (*Rude Pravo* July 10-12, 1968). W. Eichborn in his paper *On Certain Socio-Historical Aspects of the Technological Revolution* with good grounds criticised the abstract schematic view which represents a deviation from the Marxist class approach and according to which all "industrial civilisations" enslave man, making him into a one-sided alienated figure, whereas "technological civilisation" liberates him from this alienation. When this approach to the question is adopted then no fundamental distinction is drawn between diametrically opposed social systems under which both industrialisation and contemporary technological progress have quite different social consequences and the incompatibility of the social systems and the interests of antagonistic class forces is lost from view.

Soviet philosophers and Marxist theoreticians from other countries criticise these deviations from Leninist principles by the advocates of the "new Czechoslovak model for socialism" and the latter's demands for a reduction in the power assigned to the socialist state and for a reappraisal of Leninist principles with regard to the leading role of the party of the working class. In his criticism of nationalist deviations from the internationalist principles of Leninism and the uncalled-for attempts to solve problems of the technological revolution in "autonomous isolation", Comrade Eichborn demonstrates that the basic problems of the technological revolution—be they technological, economic, administrative, ideological or military in character—cannot be solved in the framework of individual socialist states; here there can be talk not only of co-operation but also of the need to develop a *firm economic, political, cultural, ideological and military community of socialist peoples and states*.*

The problem of man in the modern world in the context of the technological revolution and changes in social relations also continues to attract unabated interest of Marxist philosophers from countries other than our own. Two trends are to be observed in the treatment of this question in the works of these Marxist philosophers. A clear majority of phi-

* W. Eichborn, *On Certain Socio-Historical Aspects of the Technological Revolution*, "Philosophic Sciences", 1969, No. 3, p. 126.

losophers from the socialist countries as can be seen from the writings of a number of philosophers from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland and Rumania (as in those of their Soviet colleagues) and also in those of certain Marxist philosophers from a number of capitalist countries, start out from the premise that Marxist-Leninist philosophy commencing from the early works of Marx and Engels and up until the present day raises and investigates the problem of man as an individual in close connection with questions pertaining to the socialist transformation of society, man's liberation from all forms of oppression and alienation and the creation of conditions for the all-round development of the individual under socialism and communism. In this context some Marxist philosophers (such as C. I. Gulian for example) however regard it as essential to single out Marxist "philosophical anthropology" as a special branch of knowledge within the framework of Marxist-Leninist philosophy; others meanwhile suggest that the problem of man should be the central focus for all branches of Marxist-Leninist philosophy regardless of the angle of approach adopted ("ontology" and gnoseology, sociology, ethics, etc.), and see no need to single out any separate "philosophical anthropology" in Marxist theory. At the same time in the work of certain other philosophers outside the Soviet Union (Roger Garaudy, *Marxism in the Twentieth Century*; G. Petrović, *Philosophy and Marxism*; Milan Průcha, *The Cult of Man*, etc.), who call themselves Marxists, another tendency comes to the fore that bears a revisionist character and according to which Marxist-Leninist philosophy (apart from Marx's early works) does not investigate the problem of man as an individual, so that in this respect Marxists can take over ideas and experience from modern bourgeois philosophy (existentialism, "philosophical anthropology", etc.) including the "valuable elements" of philosophical anthropology (i.e., a number of idealistic "philosophies of life") into Marxist philosophy.

In works by Soviet and other Marxist philosophers devoted to the problem of man this erroneous trend has been subjected to critical analysis in recent years (1967-1969). It has been demonstrated in a number of works (by, for example, S. Angelov in Bulgaria, M. Klein, A. Kosing et al. in the GDR, by A. Gedō and A. Kiss in Hungary, by

T. Jaroszewski in Poland, by V. Ruml and A. Siratchky in Czechoslovakia, D. Leković and A. Stojković in Yugoslavia that Marxist-Leninist philosophy at the various stages of its development has raised and provided answers to the problem of man in close connection with the scientific understanding of the laws of nature, society and man, approaching this problem with the view to setting the individual free from all types of social, national and moral pressure by means of the class struggle and socialist revolution, and outlining realistic prospects for the all-round development of the individual, freedom and happiness of the individual under socialism and communism.*

At the same time mistaken assessments are put forward with regard to the present-day position of the individual in socialist society coming from certain philosophers who call themselves Marxists, assessments that extend beyond the confines of Marxist theory and are allied to the hostile fabrications put about by bourgeois ideologists writing on socialism. This applies first and foremost to the journals *Praxis* and *Filozofia* published in Belgrade: for example on the pages of *Praxis* S. Stojanovic declared that socialist society organised in the form of a state constitutes a "new exploiter society" where a distinction can be drawn between the bureaucratic element (the "new class") and the masses, who have no opportunity at all to "take decisions". Another writer—a "politologist" by the name of L. Tadić, flying in the face of historical truth, maintains that in the Soviet Union "after Lenin under the guise of a campaign against so-called egalitarianism, exclusive privileges were extended to the state bureaucracy which leads to a diminishing and undermining of ideals and morals."***

* *Against the Modern Bourgeois Ideology*, selected articles of German Marxists, Moscow, 1960, (in Russian); S. Angelov, *Sotsialisticheskiyat humanism i negovite sremenni krititsi*, Sofia, 1963, Bulg. ed., Ernst Bloch's *Revision des Marxismus*, Berlin, 1957; M. Fritzhand; *Człowiek, humanizm, moralność*, Warszawa, 1961; C. I. Gulian, *Problematika omului*, București, 1964; D. Leković, *Marksistička teorija otuđenja*, Beograd, 1968; *Marxistička filozofia a Komunistická strana*, Praha, 1965; *Marxistische Philosophie*, Lehrbuch, Leitung und Red. A. Kosing, Berlin, 1967, etc.

L. Tadić, "Uz problem društvene jednakosti", *Praxis* 1966, No 4-6, s. 528,

Similar assertions border on slander of socialist society and its creators, the popular masses, and constitute a direct departure from Marxist-Leninist principles testifying to the strong influence of bourgeois ideology on unstable, revisionist elements in the socialist countries.

Marxist analysis of the contradictions in society's progress towards socialism is to be found in a number of recent philosophical works. Loyal to the traditions of Marxist-Leninist dialectics philosophers from the GDR, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries analyse contradictions in the development of the socialist countries at the present stage both on a national scale and in the context of the world socialist system. Among the internal contradictions encountered during the establishment and development of socialism Marxist writers from these countries attach particular importance to the following:

1) Contradictions between the modern technological revolution and the level of development attained in production relations, a disparity between the modern level of productive forces and the growing demands of the workers;

2) Contradictions in the development of socialist society consisting, for example, in the fact that if the attitude to means of production that has grown up in countries where the foundations of socialism have been laid leads to a uniform social structure, the character of the labour being carried out often fails to correspond to the social structure of socialist society;

3) Contradictions between the principles of socialist democracy and bureaucratic distortions still to be surmounted, obsolete economic institutions and certain outdated forms and methods of organisation;

4) Contradictions between the prevailing socialist ideology and the individual's conscience (this question is treated in particular in a significant investigation by the Bulgarian philosopher, Stoyan Mikhailov—see S. Mikhailov, *Sotsializm i otzhivelitsi*, Sofia, 1967).

5) Contradictions between certain specific interests of individual peoples of the socialist world and common international interests and, linked up with these, common difficulties with regard to the development of the world socialist system. Many Marxist philosophers from other socialist coun-

tries are conducting creative research into possible new paths and forms of co-operation facilitating the solution of these contradictions; investigation of problems connected with economic integration, and scientific, technological and cultural co-operation of the countries of the world socialist system also serves this end.

At times, however, delusions and errors are to be found with regard to the interpretation of the correlation between the national and international, the particular and the universal, when national, particular interests are given a one-sided and exaggerated interpretation and contrasted with the common interests of the world socialist system. Sometimes assertions are made to the effect that under socialism the individual nation constitutes the most stable social community, it is of pivotal importance for socialist society, that the correlation of national and international elements reflects the correlation of the internal and external (in which pride of place should be accorded the "internal" or national element), etc.

Delusions and errors to which a number of theoreticians have fallen prey with regard to the interpretation of the character of the contradictions encountered in the establishment and development of socialism can be overcome in the course of subsequent purposeful work, self-criticism and comradely mutual assistance between Marxists from fraternal socialist countries.

However in the field of philosophy at times we find reflected those differences of opinion with regard to the interpretation of the character, principles and criteria of socialism which represent more than isolated mistakes and instead go to make up a whole trend of thought directed against Leninist ideology and the policy pursued by the international communist movement. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is now waging an ideological struggle against two such anti-Leninist trends in the interpretation of socialism.

The first of these is petty-bourgeois subjectivism and extremism or "Leftist" adventurism. Without troubling themselves to provide any serious foundation for their assertions "Left" extremists (Maoists, etc.) reject as anti-socialist the principle of material incentives, the goal of increased material prosperity and the all-round development of the individ-

ual, thus ignoring the fact that these principles were theoretically substantiated by Lenin and have since been borne out by the historical experience of socialist development. A typical feature of this trend is the fact that the slander poured on socialism by petty-bourgeois adventurists has much in common with Trotskyite fabrications and those of bourgeois Marxologists and "Sovietologists" (Klaus Mehnert, Leopold Labedz, Herbert Marcuse, Iring Fetscher, renegade Marxists Djilas, Leonhard, etc.) concerning the bourgeois "degeneration" of the socialist countries, the emergence within them of new "exploiter" classes and a renunciation of revolutionary ideals, etc.

The other anti-Leninist approach to socialism is the Right-wing revisionist line that veers towards bourgeois ideology and fashionable currents in idealist philosophy, such as "philosophy of life", "philosophical anthropology", existentialism, etc. This approach made itself felt in the works and lectures of various right-revisionist philosophers and journalists such as Garaudy in France and E. Fischer in Austria (both of whom have become Marxist renegades), L. Kolakowski in Poland, K. Kósik in Czechoslovakia, contributors to the Yugoslav journal *Praxis*, etc. This journal was contributed to by a number of bourgeois philosophers, renegades and unreliable elements who had resigned or been expelled from Communist parties and had left the socialist countries (some of whom are even on the editorial board). Some of these Right-revisionist philosophers who label themselves "creative" or "authentic" Marxists as opposed to philosophers from the USSR or other socialist countries, whom they accuse of "dogmatism", "Stalinism", "conformism", etc., go out of their way to smear socialism ascribing to it antagonistic, irreconcilable contradictions and declaring it to be an inhumane anti-democratic order just as capitalism. In the journal *Praxis* and other revisionist publications the technological revolution under socialism also comes in for attack; it is referred to as a "counter-revolution" leading to exploitation and suppression of the working people. Certain of these philosophers advocate social pessimism and distrust of the forces of socialism; they not only refrain from criticism of reactionary bourgeois philosophy but call for the "de-ideologisation" of philosophy, the "up-dating" of Marxism and its phi-

losophy with injections of contemporary bourgeois philosophy. The "humane socialism" or "anthropological humanism" propagated by certain representatives of this anti-Leninist trend is, as it is sometimes called, a "neo-Marxist" (or "Young-Marxist") conception which is incompatible with Marxist-Leninist ideology and the policies pursued by the international communist movement and which undermines the very foundation of this systems' most precious offspring—the world socialist system. Together with Soviet philosophers, their colleagues from a number of other socialist countries actively oppose the philosophical conceptions peculiar to "neo-Marxism" and its negative, essentially slanderous presentation of socialism.

The Subject-Matter and Structure of Marxist Philosophy

This question is being widely discussed in Marxist literature published abroad. Most Marxist philosophers outside the Soviet Union, like their Soviet colleagues, consider that Marxist-Leninist philosophy comprises the science of the most general laws governing the development of nature, society and thought, the world outlook of the revolutionary proletariat, permeated with the principles of internationalism and socialist humanism, and a methodology of scientific cognition and revolutionary action.

In the course of debate on these questions much stress is laid on the need to make man's practice, his material activity, the basic category in philosophy, underlying the solution of all philosophical problems, all of which in the final analysis are bound up with it.

The authors of the textbook, *Marxist Philosophy* (published in the GDR in 1967) and also certain of the participants in the debate appearing on the pages of the *German Philosophical Journal* (H. Seidel et al.) affirmed that "no such alternative exists as an alternative between proceeding from the concept of practice and proceeding from the concept of matter". Only in the process of practice can we approach the very concept of matter, to the laws of its development. Certain GDR writers in their country's philosophical journals have expressed the opinion that such a point of view transforms practice into the source of all reality and

thus represents a return to idealism. Other Marxist philosophers in the GDR held that acknowledgement of practice as the initial category of philosophical (and indeed theoretical) cognition must go hand in hand with the disclosure in the process of practice of the material essence of the objective world, and of the general laws governing the development of matter and knowledge.

In the course of debate on the subject-matter and structure of philosophy various contrasting points of view come to the fore. The Czech press for example criticises erroneous conceptions for the interpretation of Marxist philosophy—the “scientistic” or “cosmocentric” conception according to which philosophy is a science about the world and nature as opposed to man, and the “anthropocentric” conception, which sets up man as the measure of all phenomena and according to which there can be no talk of anything real outside human practice at all.

Clearly those Marxist philosophers are nearer the truth who approach the problem of the subject-object correlation in its dialectical unity and see as the subject of philosophy the general laws governing the development of the world and man’s relations to the external world that take shape in the process of history and social practice.

Marxist philosophy should not be confined either to “anthropocentrism” or “cosmocentrism”, it should not set up man either as the “centre of the world” or as the “measure of the world”; on the contrary it is called upon to synthesise scientific knowledge of the world and man, and demonstrate the active, creatively transforming attitude to the world inherent in man as a social being.

The question of the essence of Marxist philosophy, its essential category—is inseparably bound up with another question—that of the structure and functions of Marxist philosophy. This question is discussed in the works of many foreign Marxist philosophers.

Unlike one-sided interpretations of Marxist philosophy, though they may correctly reflect this or that significant aspect of the question (“philosophy is world outlook”, “philosophy is the ideology of the party”, “philosophy of revolutionary action”, etc.) nowadays in the works of Marxist philosophers both in the Soviet Union and abroad more and

more attention is being paid to the view that Marxist philosophy has a complex structure. They present Marxist philosophy first and foremost as a science of the general laws of development pertaining to nature, society and thought, as the foundation of the communist world outlook in which man's attitude to the world finds expression, i.e., the *world-outlook* element in the structure of Marxist philosophy; in the course of the development of man's practical and scientific activity, from among the views which go to make up his world outlook those elements of the structure of philosophy such as the "ontological", epistemological and logical elements of philosophical knowledge come more and more to the fore, acquiring an increasing degree of independence. In Marxist philosophy these elements express various aspects of the dialectical-materialist interpretation of being and knowledge, the laws of their development, i.e., the unity, and at the same time, the specific nature of materialist dialectics as the science of the universal laws pertaining to the development and theory of knowledge and logic. Thanks to the fact that philosophy acquires a universal scientific method in Marxism, it is able to provide a *methodology* for scientific thought and indeed theoretical activity as a whole. All this means that Marxist philosophy is able to perform an *ideological* function, express the interests and world outlook of a specific class, i.e., the revolutionary working class, and the socialist forces of the modern world, determine their attitude to the past, present and future stages of social development.

Given that Marxist philosophy expresses the ideology of the rising revolutionary class and is based on a firm foundation of scientific knowledge, it is able to provide a reliable solution to the problem of the individual, his freedom, happiness, all-round development, i.e., perform a *humanistic* function. This ideological element in the structure of Marxist philosophy at a specific stage of historic development "blends together", as it were, with the dialectical-materialist philosophical foundation of the communist world outlook enriched by scientific knowledge of the laws of nature, society and thought, the universal philosophical method of cognition and the revolutionary transformation of the world. This means that Marxist philosophy can constitute a com-

prehensively and scientifically substantiated system of the humanistic and revolutionary world outlook, which promotes the transformation of the world on a basis of socialism and communism.

Certain differences and occasional delusions are encountered in attempts to answer the question as to the subject-matter of Marxist philosophy and its functions. A number of attempts have been made to present Marxist philosophy as no more than a method while failing to link it up with any theoretical conception, with any historically specific solutions to philosophical or social problems, with the world outlook of the working class and Communist parties (an erroneous, anti-Leninist position of this kind was expounded by Professor Robert Havemann in his dilettante book entitled *Dialectics Without Dogma*... which was published in Hamburg and subjected to harsh criticism in the GDR).

In a number of European and Latin American countries the views of the French Marxist, Louis Althusser, have been in the news a good deal: Althusser holds that Marxist philosophy since 1845 turned its back on former hazy, unscientific humanist ideals and after evolving into a logically substantiated scientific system became "theoretical anti-humanism". Here as in other cases the scientific-cognitive and logical functions of Marxist philosophy are universalised and its humanistic function mistakenly negated. At various times Right-revisionist attempts have been made—for example by E. Fischer in Austria—to deny the ideological character of Marxist philosophy and approach it as a "general truth" bearing no relation to the class struggle of the proletariat and its world outlook, which in its turn is termed an "institutional" ideology serving to "mystify" the truth, etc. In recent years in the Yugoslav journal *Praxis* a number of articles have appeared negating philosophy as a science and declaring science to be conformist by nature and that it describes existing reality and promotes adaptation to it: in the light of this the "authentic philosophy" of Marx allegedly excludes a "scientific", i.e., scientific-cognitive, function and constitutes "critical thought of the age". One of the prominent contributors to *Praxis* Predrag Vranicki asserted in his "12 Theses", outlined at the 14th International Philosophical Congress, that with the help of Marx's method

philosophy should "extend beyond the confines of Marxism". The significance of Marxist philosophy according to this standpoint consists in the denial, the "negation" of reality in the name of the individual and his unlimited freedom. This implies a universalisation (and at the same time distortion) of the humanist or "actively critical" function of Marxist philosophy; philosophy is thus contrasted to science and ideology, the latter being based on economic and other scientific knowledge.

The point of view represented in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, embodied in the works of its founders and now being developed by Soviet and other philosophers, consists in the recognition of the dialectical unity of the functions inherent in the complex and intricate structure of philosophy. The combination and unity of scientific-cognitive, logical, methodological and ideological (and hence critical, revolutionary and humanist) functions enables Marxist philosophy to provide the scientific basis for the socialist world outlook, and makes it the critically revolutionary "philosophy of practice" equipping man to transform the world in keeping with his interests. This unity of the structure and functions of Marxist philosophy was brought out in a book by philosophers in the GDR entitled, *Marxist Philosophy*, in a work by Czechoslovak philosophers *Marxist Philosophy and the Communist Party* and in S. Vásques' *Philosophy of Practice (Filosofía de la praxis)* (according to which Marxism as the "philosophy of practice" comes into its own in mature form in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* that contains a substantiation of the interrelation between thought and action). Vásques criticises Althusser's contention excluding scientific and theoretical activity from socio-historical practice and aimed at separating theoretical knowledge from humanistic ideals that have grown up in the process of revolutionary practice. Vásques also comes out against the idea formerly upheld by G. Lukács to the effect that in his book *History and Class Consciousness (Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein)* according to which the functions of historical materialism allegedly die out in socialist society, where the objective laws of social development lose their relevance giving way to purposeful activity of individuals. Vásques goes on to criticise the views put forward by scho-

lastic romanticism remote from real life and the revolutionary struggle, who hold that philosophy is in itself already a form of practical activity, ranking above practice as "universal criticism"; he demonstrates "that philosophy neither as an interpretation of the world nor as a theoretical instrument for its transformation can be a direct or immediate practical activity".*

Among the methodological questions which have aroused considerable interest in Marxist circles abroad in recent years is the attitude of Marxist philosophy to the structuralist method. This method, that is applied in a number of humanities by foreign scholars (for example Lévi-Strauss in ethnography, Fucoco in relation to the history of culture and Barth in literary criticism, etc.) is based on the view that in sciences relating to society the decisive role is played not by the diachronic principle (i.e., the development of a system in time) but the synchronic principle (the "extra-temporal" interrelation of elements within a system). According to certain Marxist philosophers in the West (such as Althusser, Luporini) all the humanities including philosophy should be reorganised on the basis of the structuralist method. In the works of a number of French Marxists (such as L. Sève), for instance their papers presented at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party in Argenteuil and printed in special issues of the Journal *Pensée* (entitled "Structuralism and Marxism") the cognitive role of structural analysis in specific sciences is not denied, but the "theoretical anti-humanism" of the structuralist method is criticised and likewise its rejection of the active, effective role accorded to man, attempts to replace materialist dialectics by structuralism are criticised and attention is drawn to the need for a combination of structural analysis and historicism in philosophical cognition.

A similar debate took place in Italy centring chiefly round the question as to the correlation of structuralism and historicism. While Cesare Luporini maintained that Marxism (in *Capital* and elsewhere) follows a structural method and no alternative to the logical form of approach

* An analysis of S. Vásques' *Philosophy of Practice* was published in an article by A. P. Burgete in the Soviet journal *Philosophical Sciences*. No. 1, 1969.

exists, historicism he regards as a method for the idealistic interpretation of history, Galvano Della Volpe maintained that Marxist method *is* historicism and that the application of the structural method to the cognition of social phenomena leads to speculative, idealistic formalism, to a departure from the Marxist principle that truth is concrete.

Other Italian Marxists while attacking the formalistic extremes of structuralism recognise the necessity of a dialectical combination of the structural and historical methods and see the method used by Marx in his *Capital* as a model of just such a dialectical combination.

These discussions which have been taking place in foreign Marxist publications with regard to a number of topical issues, despite the wide variety of points of view represented, serve to promote the development of creative thought and the discovery of correct scientific answer to philosophical problems.

3. LENINIST TRADITIONS IN RESEARCH INTO THE PHILOSOPHICAL HERITAGE OF THE PAST AND IN THE CRITICISM OF MODERN BOURGEOIS PHILOSOPHY

Both in the USSR and abroad the sixties were a period of thorough Marxist research into national philosophical theories and the development of the history of philosophy in the world as a whole on the basis of Leninist traditions: it was a period of active scientific investigation and popularisation of man's progressive philosophical and cultural heritage.

The Leninist approach to philosophical traditions in the sixties was therefore all the more essential and fruitful, given that in present conditions both the development of national consciousness in the socialist countries and the liberated countries of the Third World and statements and writings by progressive forces in the capitalist world demand a scientific class-based analysis of the ideological stand adopted by various anti-imperialist forces, of their sources and of the diversity of national traditions in philosophy and social thought.

In the sixties Marxist literature devoted to the history of philosophy appearing abroad (at the same time as various works by Soviet historians of philosophy) was supplemented

* See the chapter "Italy" in *Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today* (in Russian).

first and foremost by a number of works on the history of Marxist philosophy in which the Leninist traditions of research into the philosophical teachings of Marx and Engels were carried forward. These included a sequel to the research by the venerable French Marxist philosopher Auguste Cornu published in Volumes II and III of his fundamental work, *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Their Life and Work* and a book by the English philosopher John Lewis *The Life and Teaching of Karl Marx* (1965) which despite a number of controversial, debatable propositions brings out the generic link between classical German philosophy and Marxist ideas on the activity of reason and demonstrates that under the influence of dialectics Marx's world outlook developed immunity to all eternal truths and complete social forms. Note should also be taken of research by GDR philosophers into various aspects of Marxist philosophy in their historical evolution, an outline survey of which was presented at the philosophical congress in Berlin on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth (March 1968) and together with a survey of Mario Rossi's three-volume work entitled *Marx and Hegelian Dialectics* and many other works by Marxist philosophers abroad. In recent years works on major questions of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy have been brought out by T. Pavlov, S. Ganovski, L. Santo, T. Jaroszewski and other foreign Marxist philosophers.

In the sixties Marxist research into the history of philosophy of various individual peoples was continued—namely the history of philosophy in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and also Italy, France and some other countries.* Important works in this field include the collection of essays *The History of Philosophical Thought in Bulgaria* edited by Todor Pavlov and others, the first volume of the *History of Marxist Philosophy in Germany* (Zur Geschichte der Marxistischen-Leninistischen Philosophie in Deutschland) published in the GDR, a collection of articles entitled *History of Rumanian Philosophy and Social Thought (Istoria gândirii sociale si filozofice in Rominia)* and other general works and

* *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1965; *A Short Survey of the History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1971; *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965 (all in Russian).

monographs on the history of philosophy pertaining to the peoples of the socialist countries.

Significant work is now being carried out by historians of philosophy in the GDR researching into the philosophical heritage of the German people. Monographs by G. Klaus on Kant's early works (1961), by D. Bergner and M. Buhr on the philosophy of Fichte and by G. Stienhler on Hegel—*Hegel and Marxism on Contradictions (Hegel und der Marxismus über den Widerspruch)*, 1960, and *The Dialectics of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit (Die Dialektik in Hegels "Phänomenologie des Geistes")*, 1964, and various other works describe and analyse the dialectical tradition in classical German philosophy that is regarded as an invaluable part of the German people's cultural heritage and an outstanding philosophical achievement in general.

In works by German Marxist philosophers attention is focussed on the role of dialectics in German idealistic philosophy at the end of the eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth in giving pride of place to the active nature of human thought, although as we are reminded, this question could not be consistently investigated on a basis of idealism. On the other hand, a new aspect of research into the philosophical heritage of the past carried out in the GDR in the fifties and sixties was unlike their predecessors who had linked the tradition in German philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries primarily with idealist systems, the Marxist philosophers demonstrated that materialist and atheistic elements in philosophy started to emerge and develop in Germany as early as the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Rugard Gropp's *The National Philosophical Heritage (Das nationale philosophische Erbe)*, 1960, the joint publication *Essays on the History of Pre-Marxian Materialism (Beiträge zur Geschichte des vormarxistischen Materialismus)* and a number of works on philosophers of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment (Herder, Goethe, Einsiedel, Forster et al.) trace the development of materialist and progressive traditions of enlightenment in Germany.

Under the impact of work by Marxist philosophers scientific research is being conducted into the history of philosophy and culture in Italy. One of the most significant

works in this field is Eugenio Garin's *Italian Culture in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Bari, 1962) and his *History of Italian Philosophy* (Volumes I-III reprinted in Turin in 1966 complete with an epilogue entitled "Chronicle of Twentieth-century Italian Philosophy"). As pointed out by S. A. Efrov, a Soviet specialist in contemporary Italian philosophy, Garin provides a scientific analysis of the history of philosophy in that country complete with convincing criticism of reactionary idealist trends of both past and present.

A number of French Marxist philosophers (such as L. Sève and G. Cogniot) are at work on research into French philosophical traditions. L. Sève in his *Contemporary French Philosophy* sets out to present the development of French philosophy in close conjunction with the history of France and the political struggle in that country, pointing to the degeneration of French bourgeois philosophy and its eclecticism.

With reference to the bourgeois philosopher Sève writes: "He has reached the point where he concocts his philosophy like a cocktail; for instance to Bergsonism and Husserl's theory of knowledge he adds a small shot of neo-Hegelianism, a generous dose of the existentialist theory of human life and all this is topped up with a drop of psychoanalysis and a slither of historical materialism."*

Major research into the philosophy of Hegel has recently been started by the President of the Hegelian Philosophical Society, the West German Marxist, V. Beier.

Among the works by foreign Marxists on the history of world philosophy special attention should be paid to broad-scale surveys by the GDR philosopher Hermann Ley (*Outline of the History of Mediaeval Materialism, History of Religious Free-Thinking and Atheism*) in which the emergence and development of latent and inconsistent elements of materialism, on the one hand, and idealism, on the other, are examined in relation to the mythological, religious and other teachings of the past.

A fundamental work in this field was brought out by

* L. Sève, *La philosophie française contemporaine et sa genèse de 1789 à nos jours*, Paris, 1962, p. 254.

the Rumanian philosopher C. I. Gulian entitled *Hegel's Method and System*; another Rumanian historian of philosophy, I. Banu brought out an *Introduction to the History of Philosophy* which is to be followed by a series of further works on the history of world philosophy.

Major Marxist works on the history of Renaissance philosophy and French philosophers such as Holbach and La-mettrie have been written since the war by the Yugoslav scholar D. Nedeljković.

A highly controversial but interesting book on the history of Western philosophy *Heroes and Heretics* has been published by the American philosopher Barrows Dunham whose approach has close affinities with dialectical materialism. It is impossible to accept the author's conception to the effect that the struggle of great heretics (such as Lucretius, Voltaire, Marx and Einstein whose names are found alongside those of St. Augustine and Freud) lies at the basis of philosophical advance, a struggle that is directed against superstition, obscurantism and the "bureaucratic orthodoxy" of the leaders of established society. Dunham meanwhile omits the prime source of the advance of philosophical ideas, namely the struggle between classes and the two main philosophical camps those of materialism and idealism. Yet due acknowledgement must be accorded Dunham's profound study of the unchanging force of progressive, revolutionary philosophical theory, which arouses such embittered hatred on the part of reactionaries in capitalist countries and particularly so in the case of Marxism-Leninism.

A number of contemporary Marxist philosophers abroad, while applying Leninist principles in their approach to philosophical ideas, as outlined in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and other works, are endeavouring now to elaborate a methodology for research into the history of world philosophy and its current developments. The International Symposium for Historians of Philosophy from the Socialist Countries held in Varna (Bulgaria) in June 1971 was convened to discuss first and foremost these particular questions.

Marxist historians of philosophy working in this field are concerned primarily with the assessment and evalua-

tion of philosophical traditions, particularly those of Marxism-Leninism and the place they will occupy in the subsequent development of philosophy.

Adhering closely to the methodological principles advocated by Lenin, Marxist historians of philosophy today demonstrate convincingly that the continuation of valuable progressive traditions, far from excluding a creative approach to philosophical thought, serves to promote the latter. An incorrect stand in relation to this question is taken up by champions of nihilism and "innovation" at any cost, who take a one-sided view of all philosophical traditions, seeing in them something limited and dogmatic which impedes the creative development of philosophy.*

In works by Soviet and other Marxist philosophers there is earnest of a thorough and solicitous approach on the part of Communist and Workers' parties at the present time to the finest traditions of philosophical thought which goes hand in hand with a creative approach to philosophical questions. With constant reference to the philosophical heritage of the past Marxist-Leninist theory does not confine itself to study of this heritage but, on its basis, works towards new solutions of philosophical, social and scientific problems of the present age.

In Marxist literature of the sixties and early seventies, both in the USSR and elsewhere important strides were made in the scientific investigation and criticism of contemporary bourgeois philosophy. While in the forties and fifties narrow and oversimplified concepts of the whole of bour-

* The Soviet philosopher G. S. Batishchev (in Chapter X of the collection of articles *Leninism and the Dialectics of Social Development*, Moscow, 1970) put forward an erroneous formulation in relation to this question of philosophical traditions, stating that: "Tradition as such is by no means an adequate form for the preservation of cultural achievements. It is always (?) in one way or another limited by virtue of its non-creative character (?). Only a critical and creative approach to the history of world culture can truly prolong the life of great attainments of the past by all peoples and of all ages, without running the risk of any omissions and any concessions to nihilism." This arbitrary contrasting of a "critically creative approach" with tradition, particularly in a book about Leninism which achieves a consistent combination of continuity of traditions with a creative, critically revolutionary spirit, cannot itself stand up to any criticism.

geois philosophy in the contemporary epoch were to be encountered in Marxist literature, which presented it as nothing but unmitigated reaction ("idealism always means regression" or "any bourgeois philosophy is anti-communist", etc.), subsequently a more detailed and discriminating approach to various trends of bourgeois philosophy including that of the modern period started to assert itself.

Apart from works by Soviet philosophers in this field which appeared in the sixties and early seventies, mention should be made of numerous works by other Marxist philosophers that investigate the history and provide a critical analysis of the bourgeois philosophy of our epoch.* Particularly important among these is Maurice Cornforth's *Marxism and the Linguistic Philosophy*: here in an analysis of the development of English empirical philosophy from Hume (whom Cornforth now regards as an opponent of religious obscurantism) to the present day, Cornforth brings us a historical assessment of this path of development, abandoning his former strictly negative approach to it. He calls attention to the benefit to be drawn from linguistic analysis which should not and cannot (as was the practice in the forties) be equated with subjective idealism, since linguistic philosophy has succeeded in the meantime in breaking free from the latter in most respects.

Cornforth departs from assertions to be found earlier in his own and others' works to the effect that the social role of empirical philosophy consists in the "reconciliation of science and religion" and demonstrates that linguistic phi-

* See *A Short Survey of the History of Philosophy*, Moscow, 1971 (in Russian); *Against the Modern Bourgeois Ideology*, selected articles of German Marxists, Moscow, 1960 (in Russian); *Against the Modern Bourgeois Falsifiers of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy*, Moscow, 1964 (in Russian); *Modern Philosophy and Ideology in West Europe and the Americas*, Moscow, 1964 (in Russian); L. Seve, *La philosophie française contemporaine et sa genèse de 1789 à nos jours*, Paris, 1962; H. Wells, *Pavlov and Freud*, New York, 1956; *French Communists in the Struggle for the Progressive Ideology*, Moscow, 1953 (in Russian); G. Besse, *Pratique sociale et théorie*, Paris, 1963; *Filozofia i socjologia XX wieku*, Warszawa, 1962; *Marxistische Philosophie*, Lehrbuch, Leitung und Red. A. Kosing, Berlin, 1967; *Die philosophische Lehre von Karl Marx und ihre aktuelle Bedeutung*, Philosophischer Kongress der DDR 1963, Berlin, 1968.

losophers are for the most part progressive liberals in practice. Like other British Marxists, Cornforth does not reject out of hand all that is said by bourgeois philosophers, simply because it has been said by them, but examines interesting and valuable logical quests in linguistic philosophy and pays tribute to positive achievements (Wittgenstein, Ryle, etc) in the investigation of logical ways of using language. John Lewis, another British Marxist, stresses in his book on Marx (1965) that victory is unattainable in our fight against imperialist reaction and obscurantism without allies.*

In Marxist philosophical literature of the sixties frequent reference is made to the humanist tendencies to be observed in some trends of contemporary bourgeois philosophy (Jean-Paul Sartre, Erich Fromm et al.) to the interest shown by such philosophers in Marxist philosophy, particularly the early works of Karl Marx.

Many Marxist philosophers regard this interest shown in Marx and the attempt at a "new interpretation" of his work in the spirit of "philosophical anthropology" and existentialism as a kind of reflection of Marxism within present-day bourgeois philosophy and indeed do so with considerable justification. However the concept of reflection is open to wide interpretation: reactionary neo-Thomistic theories of Bocheński or Sidney Hook's pragmatic championing of capitalism, starting out from a blatantly anti-communist standpoint, are quite a different matter from the conceptions of Sartre or Fromm.

It would of course be adopting an oversimplified and vulgarised approach to maintain that every bourgeois philosopher who is after a new, i.e., his "own" interpretation of Marx does this out of subversive, anti-communist motives. Full recognition should be accorded the popularity and attractiveness of Marx's humanistic and critical ideas for Left, liberal and democratic sections of the bourgeois intelligentsia, certain philosophers included.

In *La nouvelle critique* under the general title "Is Sartre a Marxist?" containing contributions from various authors,

* Works by British Marxists on the history of philosophy are examined by Y. P. Mikhaleiko in his book *Leninism and Contemporary Problems of the History of Philosophy* and in Marx's "*Capital*" and the *Ideological Struggle Today*, Moscow, 1968 (in Russian).

A. Gisselbrecht writes that dialogue with Sartre and his followers is warranted and useful: it is not possible to align oneself with Sartre but he should not be excluded and set apart from the sphere of progressive thought and philosophy, for "Sartre's ideas are evolving". Sartre, however, as was aptly noted by another French philosopher Jean Rony "deliberately underestimates the importance of Marxist science."^{*} If Marxism lacks as yet a comprehensive elaboration of the problem of man, this is not going to be accomplished on the basis of Sartre's existentialism. Gisselbrecht takes into account that Sartre still contrasts his position with Leninism and the communist movement, as was often the case in the past.

A serious error and departure from the truth in the above-mentioned article by Gisselbrecht is his uncritical acceptance of the misguided assertion implicit in Sartre's work to the effect that "Stalinist dogmatism" has affected the whole of the communist movement and his ill-grounded assertions that "Marx's Marxism" needs to be freed of all vestiges of "Leninist dogmatism". Interpretations of Marxism propounded by Herbert Marcuse and other representatives of the Frankfurt school of idealist philosophy are criticised in the works of R. Steigerwald.

In Marxist literature brought out abroad during the sixties various new approaches to non-Marxist bourgeois philosophy of the present period, in particular teachings from the sphere of religious philosophy, were outlined. Marxist philosophers examine and attempt to answer the following aspects of this question:

1) Should our attitude to the adherents of religion change now and are dialogues with Catholics and other representatives of religious ideology called for in this connection?

2) Can non-Marxist, non-socialist humanism be progressive in the present epoch and are we justified in talking of the "competition" between various currents of humanism and their possible alliance?

3) Can Marxist philosophy "assimilate" any particular "elements" of contemporary non-Marxist thought and what

* "Sartre est-il marxiste?", *La nouvelle critique*, 1966, No. 173-174 p 125.

in this connection should be our attitude to the platform of so-called "open Marxism"?

4 Do Lenin's ideas regarding the non-scientific and reactionary nature of bourgeois philosophy as expressed in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* preserve their relevance and force or has the development of bourgeois philosophy and sociology since that time introduced amendments bearing on the answer to this problem?

What kind of answers do present-day Marxist philosophers give to these questions?

It would be wrong to consider that religion has always and everywhere played a purely reactionary role, we are reminded by many of these philosophers, for example the American Marxist H. Aptheker. Communist parties in a number of countries talk of the need for a dialogue with religious believers, mainly on socio-historical questions and those concerning the common struggle against imperialism and reaction in the interests of democratic and socialist transformation. Certain philosophers, calling themselves Marxists but who several years ago actually embarked on a revisionist path interpret too freely this dialogue between Communists and Catholics, declaring that common ground can be found between the two and indeed beyond the confines of the questions listed above, even concerning those relating to the sphere of world outlook. Roger Garaudy for instance (in *From Anathema to Dialogue, Marxism in the Twentieth Century*, etc.) picks out common elements in Marxism and Christianity ("subjectivity" and "transcendentalism") which from his point of view could permit of integration. French Marxist philosophers Guy Besse, Lucien Sève and Comrade Waldek Rochet came out against such "integration" of Marxist and Christian world outlooks, which they considered diametrically opposed and incompatible, although in their eyes this need not stand in the way of an alliance between workers and Communists, on the one hand, and Christians, on the other, in the fight against imperialism and their efforts to achieve social transformations.

In French, Polish, Rumanian, Czechoslovak and other philosophical literature the question has recently been discussed as to whether humanism in bourgeois philosophy is

not strictly a thing of the past. Despite assertions from "Left" revisionists that humanism is an antiquated and reactionary phenomenon belonging to the distant past and unlike those who (such as Régis Debray in his book *Revolution in the Revolution?*) regard revolutionary Marxism as "theoretical anti-humanism" that abandons the allegedly "unscientific ideals" of humanism, many Marxist philosophers after analysing the humanist aspects of certain trends in modern bourgeois philosophy and sociology conclude it is essential to distinguish between the reactionary anti-communist line and those bourgeois-democratic traditions which could not be elaborated and made use of in the struggle against the imperialism and reaction, militarism and obscurantism of the all-powerful capitalist monopolies. In a number of works by foreign Marxist philosophers attention is called to the need for an ideological struggle aimed at convincing people holding non-Marxist views that communist ideals are just, that Marxist philosophy and socialist humanism are viable and relevant to the modern world and likewise socialist humanism, which unlike humanism in the abstract and the pessimism typical of bourgeois ideologists, constitutes a "philosophy of optimism".

Many foreign Marxist philosophers consider with good reason that it would be wrong to disregard the existence of such problems as alienation in capitalist society and the need to overcome it, the freedom and responsibility of the individual, the purpose of life, etc., to ignore or regard these as pseudo-problems simply because they were first brought up in bourgeois philosophy and now preoccupy a number of its representatives. Faulty solutions to a problem do not discredit the problem as such and there are no such things as materialist or idealist sets of problems while there do exist materialist or idealist solutions to problems.

Some foreign philosophers propose that a Marxist *Novum organum* should be set up for the criticism of bourgeois philosophy with special reference to the problems that it is now grappling with. There is ample scope for such a scheme particularly with regard to the philosophical searchings of non-Marxist philosophers and thinkers in the field of symbolic logic, semantics, the philosophy of science, certain methods and theories of empirical sociology in the

West, in particular its major achievements in research in connection with the "sociology" of education, leisure, culture (Chombait de Lauwe, Dumazedier et al.) and in some scientific research into the history of philosophy of an almost Marxist character (the work of E. Garin in Italy, etc.) and so on and so forth.

However such contrasting of the formulation and solution of problems in Marxism and various non-Marxist trends of contemporary philosophy, taking into account the theoretical searchings and concrete achievements of the advocates does not in any way imply that consistent Marxists could accept the revisionist point of view of men like Garaudy, Kósik, Průcha who propose that Marxism should incorporate "valuable elements of non-Marxist thought" (Heidegger, Sartre, Kierkegaard, Husserl, etc.) in other words virtually submerge Marxist philosophy in the bourgeois world outlook. Our understanding of Marxism as an evolving system of knowledge and convictions ready to incorporate new scientific discoveries, a system which has never been and is not a "closed system", nonetheless cannot reconcile itself with the platform of "open Marxism" that leads to an eclectic combination of the bourgeois and socialist world outlook, or rather a swallowing up of the latter by the former.

In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin expressed the idea that while bourgeois scholars succeed with regard to specific questions in making valuable discoveries, when it came to the general theory of political economy or philosophy, they could never be taken at their word. The principled and viable nature of this tenet of Lenin's is indisputable in our times; mention is made of this fact by Guy Besse, A. Gedö, V. Ruml and other foreign Marxists.

Meanwhile Marxism-Leninism does not deny that some representatives of bourgeois philosophy and sociology can in the present epoch as well draw up and skilfully apply valuable specific scientific methods, evolve various specific theoretical conceptions, such as sociological "middle position" theories, not confining themselves only to collecting valuable material together. Theories of this kind are to be found in the field of logic and the theory of knowledge and also in the field of sociology (for example structural method,

quantitative methods in sociology, rational conceptions in "sociology of the family", "sociology of culture", "sociology of leisure", the application of certain findings from psychoanalysis to social psychology, etc.). Yet the acknowledgement of the relative scientific value not only of "materials", but also of various "middle position" theories and methods of cognition used in non-Marxist philosophy and sociology, their detailed analysis and critical application do not in the least imply possibility or the need to "integrate" Marxist and non-Marxist philosophy and sociology. The ideological struggle between the Marxist and bourgeois world outlook, particularly in the fields of philosophy and sociology was and remains an essential pattern of the development of Marxist philosophical thought.

The rich diversity of Marxist philosophical literature appearing in foreign countries bears witness to new interests, new formulations of important theoretical problems and creative searching for their solution.

Marxist philosophers in various countries do not advance along divergent paths, although the problems to be answered in the sphere of philosophical thought in themselves and their theoretical level in these countries are far from identical. Most Marxist philosophers outside the Soviet Union now take as their starting point the principles of dialectical materialism, although their interpretations of these principles do not always coincide. Mistakes and delusions do occur, particularly in connection with topical problems of socialist construction and the role of Leninism in philosophy. Particularly in countries where the influence of bourgeois philosophy has made itself felt and still more so where anti-socialist, Right-revisionist and Left-extremist forces are especially active, dangerous departures from the principles and traditions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy do occur, sometimes leading to a virtual convergence with non-Marxist philosophy. It is vital that foreign researchers into Marxist philosophy should be able to detect the nature of the trends of development in Marxist philosophy in different countries in relation to both philosophical and social problems.

Soviet philosophers lay no claim to the role of teachers or mentors in relation to other Marxist philosophers; at the

same time they remain the most experienced experts in this field familiar with long traditions of struggle to uphold Leninism in philosophy and promote its creative development, and they can and should set an example for the bold elaboration of new questions.

It would be unreasonable and incorrect to place outside Marxist philosophy and rank among the revisionists those foreign Marxist philosophers who, while adhering in the main to the principles of Marxist philosophy, sometimes come up with controversial and even erroneous interpretations of certain philosophical questions, for which they are subjected to comradely criticism in their own parties.

It would be still less wise to repeat a time-serving approach to the evaluation of the philosophical works of those Marxists, who although they have made various mistakes at one time or another, in the main have adhered to Marxist principles.

When elucidating the link between philosophy and politics and criticising the reactionary and opportunist conclusions drawn from philosophical teachings, Marxists avoided equating in each case philosophical and political views. An interesting idea in this respect was expounded by Plekhanov in his day: "A thinker who sympathises with *reactionary* aspirations in society, can nevertheless evolve a philosophical system deserving of close *attention* and even *sympathy* on the part of *progressives*. It is important to distinguish between such writers' *theoretical premise* and the practical *conclusions* which they themselves draw from their theoretical premises. Practical conclusions can be either incorrect or detrimental to the cause of human progress. But at the same time the *premises* underlying these incorrect or detrimental *conclusions* can be both correct and beneficial—beneficial in the sense that, *if interpreted correctly*, they can provide a new argument or indeed a whole series of arguments in support of *progressive* aspirations."*

The most important conclusion to be drawn from this analysis of contemporary Marxist philosophical literature published abroad is that it is essential to intensify the

* G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, in five volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1956, p. 682 (in Russian).

ideological struggle to uphold Leninist principles in philosophy, to surmount the influence of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois world outlook in the Marxist movement, and shake free of all Right and "Left" revisionist socio-political and philosophical conceptions.

4. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LENINIST PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT TODAY

The question as to the role of Leninism in philosophy, Leninist principles and traditions and topical problems concerning the growing significance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in relation to the development of the international communist movement, progressive science and culture are some of the key issues in the ideological struggle between socialism and imperialism that is becoming more and more intense during its present stage, the struggle of ideas in the international labour movement and in the field of social thought.

Marxist-Leninist principles and philosophy have always aroused sharply negative response from bourgeois and revisionist ideologists and still do so today. While some of the specific propositions of Marxist philosophy, economic and social theory (for example those concerning the decisive role of the productive forces for society and the growing importance of science, the changing character of labour and intellectual life in the process of historical development, the alienation of "man's ontological forces" and overcoming this, etc.) are considered more or less acceptable and applicable in certain cases by bourgeois and revisionist interpreters of Marxism, the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, including the philosophical principles of dialectical materialism give rise to critical attacks and vehement invective. These principles of Marxism-Leninism are viewed by the opponents and certain "critics" of Leninism, who call themselves Marxists, such as Ernst Fischer in Austria, D. Grlic and other contributors to the Zagreb journal *Praxis*, as "obstacles" in the way of creative thought or "fetters" restricting the individual's awareness and they are referred

to as dogmas", "party narrow-mindedness", "sectarianism", etc. There is good reason for this, since while certain tenets of Marxist theory, wrested from context and "integrated" with various bourgeois ideas and theories, may not constitute any serious danger for the opponents of communism, the overall principles of Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy embody and concentrate the main, essential and immutable achievement of Marxist theory.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in June 1969 provided a model of staunch loyalty to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism illustrating the movement's unshakeable determination to put these principles into practice. Refuting all manner of bourgeois and revisionist fabrications about the departure of the majority of Communist and Workers' parties from Leninist principles, the Address issued after the Meeting and entitled "On the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" made it quite clear: "Communists regard it as their task firmly to uphold the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in the struggle against all enemies, steadfastly to make them a living reality, constantly to develop Marxist-Leninist theory and enrich it on the basis of present experience of waging the class struggle and building socialist society. Communists will always be true to the creative spirit of Leninism."*

"Critics" of Marxist-Leninist principles and philosophy are unable or unwilling to appreciate that principles which took shape in the historical process of the practical and theoretical activity of Communists and which reflect the objective laws of social development can have nothing in common with dogmatism, for they are constantly in the process of dialectical development and being enriched, modified and made more cohesive in the course of that development.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was completely justified in noting in its documents that international developments in our epoch have borne out the historical truth of Leninist principles.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969* Prague 1969, p. 41

Lenin's historical and dialectical-materialist approach to the real world is clearly reflected at the present time in the activity of the Communist and Workers' parties. Leonid Brezhnev's address to the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in June 1969 contained a theoretical analysis of the internal contradictions of contemporary imperialism and the special features of its present stage of development (i.e., in the 1960s), an analysis based on Lenin's dialectical theory of imperialism. These features distinguishing the processes at work within imperialism at its present stage to an important extent stem from the struggle between the two systems of socialism and capitalism, to the implications of which imperialist governments have had to start to adapt.

The Main Document issued by this International Meeting constituted a continuation of the Leninist dialectical analysis of imperialism calling attention to the fact that the technological revolution accelerates the process of economic socialisation and that this phenomenon in countries dominated by monopoly capital will lead to the proliferation of social antagonisms on a still greater scale and at an ever increasing pace. In these conditions not only will all former contradictions be aggravated but new ones will emerge: the contradiction between unparalleled opportunities made possible by the technological revolution and the obstacles created by present-day capitalism in the path of this revolution; the contradiction between the social character of modern production and its state-monopolist administration; the deepening antagonism between the interests of the majority of the nation and those of the finance oligarchy. On the other hand, the Document and Leonid Brezhnev's report to the Meeting provided a dialectical analysis of the development of world socialism, calling attention to the fact that, despite all the difficulties and problems facing the socialist countries and the differences between the Communist parties of various countries, nevertheless the consolidation of the socialist countries was proceeding apace and all-round co-operation between them was developing which was promoting socialist integration.

In the documents of this Meeting and in the reports delivered at it much emphasis was laid on the need for a

dialectical and historical approach to the forms and methods of the revolutionary struggle engaged in by the proletariat and the Communist parties; criticism was directed at attempts to present various forms and methods used in specific countries as universally applicable and to impose them on other countries.

The reports delivered at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and its documents which constituted a continuation and elaboration of Leninist traditions in the concrete historical conditions of the present period bear indisputable witness to the force and viability of Marxist-Leninist dialectics, to its organic link with the revolutionary practice of the international communist movement.

The tradition of the revolutionary teaching of Marxism-Leninism, including that in the field of philosophy, a tradition that has borne the test of time and showed itself to be viable in changing and developing conditions, provided and continues to provide the scientific and theoretical substantiation of the historic role of the proletariat in the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into communist society. One of Lenin's great achievements was the comprehensive—economic, philosophical and political—substantiation of the growing revolutionary initiative and creative constructive role of the working class in the twentieth century. In the Address of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties entitled the "Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" it is pointed out: "The acknowledged leader of the world working class, Lenin saw in the proletariat the leading force able to carry out the historic task of overthrowing capitalism and bringing about the socialist transformation of society. It was he who evolved the theory of the alliance between the working class and peasantry. Upholding unity of the working-class movement, Lenin was irreconcilably opposed to opportunism in all its forms."*

Lenin's ideas with regard to the leading role of the working class in the socialist transformation of society are carried

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 40.*

forward and elaborated by the Communist and Workers parties of today.

It should also be noted that in the sixties the campaign of bourgeois and reformist ideologists to clamp down on the revolutionary activity of the contemporary proletariat and to cast doubts on its capacity to bring about radical changes in society was considerably intensified. Inconsistent and disruptive illusions concerning the "integration" of the working class within the capitalist system were spread abroad, illusory ideas to the effect that the working class was becoming the "social partner" of the ruling classes, that the labour movement in the context of the technological revolution was bound to be bereft of its former leading role, etc. Ideologists of the monopoly bourgeoisie and reformists are going out of their way to "prove" that the interests of the workers, all working people, could be satisfied without the revolutionary transformation of society and have recourse to various forms of propaganda in the interests of capitalism, that is falsely represented as the "universal welfare state" or the "affluent society", etc.

In a number of foreign countries pseudo-revolutionary theories are propagated by extremists who would have us believe that the leading role in the modern revolutionary process passes from the hands of the working class to the "dissident strata" of the population in the backward countries and to their national-liberation movements—to those groups of workers remaining outside the confines of "organised labour" (seasonal workers, unemployed, etc.), to the "underprivileged strata of the population in the affluent society" (impoverished middle sections of the urban population, etc.) and in particular to student youth and certain sections of the intelligentsia. Bourgeois ideologists and reformists, following close on their heels, declare as a result that Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the theory of scientific communism, Marxist teaching on the international and historic role of the working class and on the proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat are an outdated anachronism with no relevance to the present situation. They criticise mass action of the working class as futile and "anarchic" and channel the labour movement into bourgeois parliamentarianism, etc. A position close to this, although

somewhat different in relation to the propositions of Marxist philosophy concerning the role of the working class, is adopted by Left-bourgeois extremists (such as Herbert Marcuse) and the closely allied "theoreticians" of petty-bourgeois "revolutionarism"—Trotskyites, anarchists, Maoists and other "Left" revisionists. Despite their verbal indictment of modern capitalism and the bourgeois state (in the same breath as unbridled slander of the socialist states and Communist parties) these extremists although they may be seen to wave the "cardboard sword" of revolt and "spontaneous explosion" are basically at one with reactionary and reformist ideologists. They deny the leading role of the working class in the transformation of contemporary society and encourage young people to take part in ill-prepared, adventurist schemes, have no use for legal forms of revolutionary activity or opportunities for using parliamentary forms of struggle.

The Main Document issued at the end of the 1969 International Meeting contains a profound and well-argued theoretical conclusion to the effect that "the main force in this democratic alliance is the working class. These objectives can be achieved, above all, by diverse forms of powerful mass action by the working class and the broadest sections of the population. While making use of all possibilities of parliamentary activity, Communists emphasise that the mass movement of the working class and of all working people is the decisive factor in the struggle for democracy and socialism".*

In the context of the intensifying ideological struggle one of the most important tasks facing Marxist-Leninist theoreticians including philosophers is consistent opposition to anti-Leninist, anti-proletarian conceptions concerning the "failing revolutionary spirit" of the working class, the scientific substantiation of the objective intensification of the world revolutionary process headed by the working class, the criticism of all bourgeois, extremist and revisionist attempts to "obliterate" the incompatibility of proletarian and bourgeois ideologies.

Great harm is dealt to the international communist move-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 27.*

ment and the struggle against reactionary and imperialist ideology by the propagation of the peaceful coexistence of ideologies, the elimination of the struggle between different parties in the sphere of philosophical and social thought stemming from revisionist elements in a number of foreign countries, as exemplified in the works of the Austrian publicist Ernst Fischer. In his books *Art and Coexistence* and *Marx in His Own Words* (and also his earlier work *Marxism and Ideology*) Fischer calls for a rejection of the principle of ideological struggle in the sphere of culture, art, the humanities, and an abandonment of the terms "proletarian", "bourgeois", "progressive" and "reactionary", which from a revisionist point of view impede cultural co-operation between peoples and "untrammelled" freedom of thought. In his book *Lenin in His Own Words* Fischer and his co-author Franz Marek distorting historical truth maintain that in the course of the historical development of the labour movement a sort of dogmatic philosophy has become the creed of millions of workers: they go on to say that "during the advance of the masses Marxism has been mechanically oversimplified, its philosophy has been virtually emasculated and reduced to dogmatism which, with the help of the 'iron necessity of history', has paralysed the development of freedom and responsibility. . . . This was how an institutionalised ideology grew up, which with reference to science has been propagating a mystifying variety of vulgar materialism".*

In their rejection of the class approach to non-Marxist ideas and their slander of revolutionary Marxist thought in the present epoch Ernst Fischer and others of the same mould attempt to bring about an intellectual disarming of the working class and open the doors for the dissemination of bourgeois ideology in the ranks of the labour movement.

The policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems in no way implies, as pointed out in the Main Document issued by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "either the preservation of the socio-political status quo or a weakening of the ideo-

* E. Fischer and F. Marek, *Was Lenin wirklich sagte*, Wien. 1959, S. 18.

logical struggle. It helps to promote the class struggle against imperialism on a national and world-wide scale".*

This document contained a high assessment of the development of co-operation and joint action for Communists and large groups of Catholics or other believers which it sees as possessed of considerable significance in the present political situation and advocates "the dialogue between them on issues such as war and peace, capitalism and socialism, and neo-colonialism and the problem of the developing countries", since this could well mean that "the mass of religious people can become an active force in the anti-imperialist struggle and in carrying out far-reaching social changes".**

Dialogues between Marxists and non-Marxists on topical social and political problems, the broad exchange of ideas, the encouragement of representatives of various sectors and groups with varying political, philosophical and religious convictions to join forces in the struggle to reduce international tension and consolidate peace and the utilisation of contradictions between various currents in bourgeois ideology in no way imply any departure by Communists from principles of Marxism-Leninism, any "ideologisation" of Marxist thought or transition to a platform of "open Marxism".

Marxists in France, Austria, the USA, Latin America and other parts of the world criticise attempts at too free an interpretation of the dialogue between Marxists and non-Marxists, erroneous tendencies to erase the dividing line between Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois positions when it comes to world outlook and to extend the principles of peaceful coexistence to the sphere of ideology.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is an active force in the battle of ideas within the international labour and liberation movements. At the present stage of ideological and political development particular importance should be accorded detailed theoretical analysis of contemporary problems, discussions between like-minded Marxists at theoretical

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 31.*

** *Ibid.*, p. 27.

conferences, seminars and in the press, discussion and comradely criticism of erroneous ideas and delusions in the works of certain Marxists, the ideological struggle to ensure that every Communist, and every Marxist philosopher does not deviate from the correct path and adheres loyally to Marxist-Leninist principles in theoretical, ideological and political work.

In this last quarter of the twentieth century, the world communist movement, characterised by increasingly intense battle between the forces of socialism and imperialism, despite all problems in its path and all the differences discernible within its ranks remains as strong as ever thanks to its loyal observance of Marxist-Leninist principles, adherence to the philosophy of dialectical materialism, its creative theoretical approach and its uncompromising attitude to bourgeois ideology and opportunism.

The Communist and Workers' Parties declared to the whole world at their 1969 forum: *"Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to proletarian internationalism, and dedicated and devoted service in the interests of their peoples and the common cause of socialism are a requisite for the efficacy and correct orientation of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, a guarantee that they will achieve their historic goals."**

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 38.*

CHAPTER VI

ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY OF MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY TOPICAL IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESENT-DAY IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

1. THE HISTORY OF MARXISM-LENINISM AND ITS PHILOSOPHY—CONTROVERSIAL TERRAIN IN THE PRESENT IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Among the key problems that have been in the centre of the present ideological battle for many years are those connected with the history of Marxism-Leninism. In the present situation it is impossible to analyse and evaluate any contemporary socio-political or philosophical trend complete with its ideology, principal aims and real influence without turning to the lessons of history, to the ideological and theoretical experience of the international communist movement, to the history of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Among those ideological and political trends which in one way or another oppose Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy and proffer an alien interpretation of the history of Marxism and the problems now confronting it that is hostile to the spirit of Leninism, the following are the most prominent: 1) bourgeois Marxology (whose typical representatives include Joseph Bocheński, Thomas J. Blakeley, Gustav Wetter, Wolfgang Leonhard, Alfred Meyer and Sidney Hook) which openly attacks Marxist-Leninist philosophy and distorts its history from positions of modern idealist philosophy*; 2) Left-bourgeois conceptions put

* Bourgeois Marxologists include in our view not merely those professionally engaged in the study and "refutation" of Marxist-Leninist teaching but also bourgeois philosophers, sociologists, economists, historians and other representatives of non-Marxist opinion, who in their own particular ways interpret Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy from the standpoint of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois ideology. Not all representatives of bourgeois Marxology are anti-Communists, but all the ideologists

forward by Western bourgeois philosophers (Herbert Marcuse, Ernst Bloch, Jean-Paul Sartre, Erich Fromm, etc.) claiming to "amend", "renew" and "creatively develop" Marxism and its philosophy by subtracting from it Leninism and Leninist principles and replacing Marxism by either abstract humanist liberal-bourgeois ideas, or pseudo-revolutionary, extremist ones; 3) reformist and revisionist conceptions that can be traced back to bourgeois philosophical and sociological doctrines; masked in a number of cases as "neo-Marxism" they are designed to rob Marxist philosophy of its committed spirit, its revolutionary traditions and "free" it from its supreme achievement, namely, Leninism; 4)

of anti-communism count among their weapons the reactionary trends in bourgeois Marxology.

"Sovietology" is one of the most reactionary branches of modern bourgeois Marxology: its leading practitioners in the field of socio-political thought include Zbigniew Brzezinski, Alfred Meyer, L. Löwenthal, Adam Ulam, and those in the field of philosophy Joseph Bocheński, Gustav Wetter, Thomas J. Blakeley, Sidney Hook, Irving Fetscher. The main aim of Sovietology is the propaganda of anti-communism and the slandering of communist teaching, the socialist order, Soviet society, the "refutation" of Leninism, and politics of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries, disguised as "scientific research", "objective analysis", etc. The Dominican philosopher Joseph Bocheński attempts in vain to present Sovietology as a "young scientific discipline", a "science which concerns itself with communism as such", although he is compelled to acknowledge that the majority of Sovietologists "do not possess any scientific knowledge" and have "no grounding in twentieth-century development and in the specific nature of communism" which means that "all the nonsense that is written prejudices the opportunities for this work, which in itself is being discredited". Zbigniew Brzezinski, one of the pillars of American Sovietology who played a notorious role in the subversive activity of anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia in 1968 recently made public the scheme behind the subversive activity of the Sovietologists, maintaining that the harmonious relations between Soviet society and the other socialist countries would be threatened in view of the infiltration of alien conceptions, or the relativisation of ideology as a result of the fact that it will be interpreted in varying ways in the different communist states. In either case there would be a threat of the gradual undermining of unswerving faith in that ideology.

An interesting critical analysis of modern "Sovietology" is found in the recently published book by I. T. Yakushevsky *Leninism, Revolution and "Sovietology"* (Leningrad, 1968) and earlier publications by Y. A. Krasin *The "Sociology of Revolution" Versus Revolution* (Moscow, 1966) and L. V. Skvortsov's *Ideology and Tactics of Anti-Communism* (Moscow, 1967), etc. (all in Russian)

“Left” petty-bourgeois and adventurist revisionism that vulgarises materialist dialectics and replaces it by subjectivism and voluntarism while also rejecting in nihilist fashion the valuable achievements of world science and culture and the finest traditions of Marxist-Leninist thought.

Although each of these trends in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois revisionist Marxology has its own distinctive features, distorting Marxist-Leninist philosophy and its history in its own particular way there are common features linking them. In the first place comes the open or disguised struggle against Leninism, against its creative principles and revolutionary traditions, its method, namely materialist dialectics. In addition there is the goal of the ideological disarmament of the world communist movement through deformation of Marxist philosophical teaching and the linking-up of Marxism with versions of the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois world outlook.

The main method employed for distorting Marxist-Leninist philosophy and its history at the present time is the “deideologisation” of present-day philosophy. This concept comes clearly to the fore in the work by the American sociologist Daniel Bell entitled *The End of Ideology*, *L’opium des intellectuels* by French sociologist Raymond Aron, *Political Power* by the leading American anti-communist Brzezinski and other works by opponents of Marxism. Appeals from bourgeois philosophers are now frequently heard for a “renaissance” of Marxism, its “renewal” with the help of various fashionable “contemporary” philosophical and social doctrines. Erich Fromm, for example, is willing to acknowledge that in a number of countries, particularly those that have recently won their independence, “socialism and Marxism are appealing not because of economic achievements of Russia... but because of the spiritual elements of justice, equality and universality which are inherent in Marxist socialism”.^{*} A mere three years later however this same Fromm in the work cited earlier, *Problems of Interpreting Marx*, arrives at a quite incorrect conclusion, distorting the actual course of the history of Marxism, to the effect that “there are small groups of radi-

* E. Fromm. *Marx's Concept of Man*, New York, 1961, p. VII.

cal socialist humanists, who express and revise Marxist socialism, and who try to contribute to the growth of socialist humanism which is as different from Soviet communism as it is from capitalism".*

Modern Marxism in the eyes of its critics, including those who call themselves Marxists, has allegedly undergone deformation. Marxism-Leninism is often presented by its critics as either eschatology, i.e., an unscientific doctrine bearing on the inevitable dawn of "heaven on earth", or as something akin to scientific positivism, with its formalised, pseudo-scientific system of laws and categories. In any case it is a concept declared alien to socialist humanism which allegedly suppresses man, ignoring his "anthropological essence" and remaining indifferent to the fate of the individual, condemning it to slavish service of modern technology.**

Many bourgeois philosophers and sociologists propound the retrograde theory that the growth of education not only in communist countries but also under capitalism makes inevitable class distinctions and the emergence of an elite set over against the people. They often maintain that the increasing "intellectualisation" of society in the context of the present technological revolution cannot fail to lead to a "deideologisation" of philosophy and sociology, to a rejection of Marxism-Leninism by philosophers, sociologists and other intellectuals in the socialist countries. When one of the doyens of bourgeois "Sovietology", Joseph Bocheński, who publishes a special quarterly *Studies in Soviet Thought*, is asked what the future holds for Soviet philosophical thought and whether there is any hope of it becoming less ideological and moving away from dialectical materialism, he replies that "Soviet philosophy" will evidently not reject materialism, because, for as long as philosophy has existed, there have always been present in it materialism and idealism, and there has always been a struggle going on between the two. However he goes on to say that philosophy in the Soviet Union is bound nevertheless to shake free of ideology,

* E. Fromm, "Problems of Interpreting Marx", *The New Sociology. Essays in Social Science and Social Theory*, New York, 1964, p. 195.

** See R. Supek, "Der technokratische Szientismus und der sozialistische Humanismus", *Praxis*, 1967, No. 2.

in so far as there are now, in his view, at work in socialist society processes typical of all "industrial countries", processes of "intellectualisation" and the assimilation of knowledge received from other countries, the spread of "un-classified doctrines" in various fields of philosophical knowledge that are free of ideology, etc., all of which in Bocheński's view could lead to a "deideologisation" of Soviet science, philosophy included.

Bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, as is only too clear from the conceptions of Raymond Aron, Daniel Bell, the late Pitirim Sorokin and other anti-Marxist ideologists, are counting on the elimination of Marxism "by peaceful means" and propagating the imminent "decease of ideology" as a result of the modern technological revolution. In this connection they allude to the "common denominators" of technology, natural science and cybernetics in "industrial societies" despite their differing political systems. They put their trust in the processes at work within these societies such as urbanisation, the rise in levels of education for the population at large, the sharp increase in the proportion of educated people and brainworkers in the population, the introduction of technology and mass media into people's everyday lives, etc. They cherish the hope that a "consumer" psychology—the individualist urge to acquire money, material comforts and entertainment—will take root in men's minds, particularly those of young people, in the socialist countries as well as their own and then proceed to oust progressive ideals and political convictions, the collective spirit, high moral standards, etc. They reckon that in the course of scientific and technological progress this bourgeois-individualist "consumer" psychology, not yet uprooted entirely in the socialist countries will "burst into flower" eroding socialist ideology which will then undoubtedly give way to "integrated" attitudes based on "common sense" and technical considerations rather than principled ideas and moral standards.

In these calculations of bourgeois ideologists on the "erosion" of socialist ideology, and likewise on the "convergence" or "integration" of the capitalist and socialist world considerable space is devoted to the philosophical aspect of the ideological disarming of the forces of socialism, to the

undermining of the Marxist principles underlying their world outlook.

While in order to poison the minds of broad strata of the population in the socialist countries the "consumer-psychology" line of approach is adopted, individualism is cultivated and the pragmatic narrowing of people's horizons is pursued, mainly with the help of applied knowledge and technical skills, indifference to ideals and disregard of class, patriotic and international duties, in order to influence the creative intelligentsia on the other hand, another line of approach is used, namely "deideologisation" of its attitudes, increased speculating with the intelligentsia's noble endeavour to preserve and multiply the cultural achievements of the past and pursue humanist ideals.

As for philosophy, anti-Marxist ideologists, and the revisionists following in their footsteps, seek to eliminate the principle of commitment in philosophy and its role as a world outlook, to work towards a narrow professionalisation of philosophical knowledge and its divorce from the realities of everyday life and from politics and to bring it closer to the philosophical and sociological concepts current in the West, i.e., with the bourgeois world outlook.

There also exists a considerable variety of "pluralist" tactics for driving a wedge between communists and the international labour movement. These channels are used by bourgeois ideologists in their attempts to "scatter" along paths leading in different directions the integrated, monolithic socialist world outlook based on the theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Critics of Marxism-Leninism also spread abroad their favourite hypothesis to the effect that the future of Marxist theory is full of problems, since its subsequent development will, they maintain, end in disruption and collapse in so far as it is inevitable and quite natural in our times that various conflicting trends will take shape in Marxist philosophy. They make use of nationalistic ideas to the effect that "national" or "regional" (for instance Asian) and other such "local" forms of Marxism are particularly viable and go on to forecast the collapse of communist teaching and the breaking up of Marxist theory into a number of conflicting national trends. Communism in theory and nationalism in

practice, according to bourgeois Marxologists, is the "Achilles' heel" of present-day Marxism and this "discovery" sends them into raptures.

M. Mikulak in his article *Philosophy and Science* published in a London journal writes: "It is tempting to conclude that the basically monist Nineteenth-century Marxist-Leninist philosophical schema, is a process of succumbing to some form of pluralism in order to accommodate the outlook of twentieth-century science and to maintain peace in the no-man's land between philosopher and scientist."*

This acceptance of the triumph of the "pluralist" approach to philosophical problems, that is even penetrating some circles in Marxist philosophical thought is based on the false conceptions of bourgeois Marxologists who would have us believe that three trends are developing in Soviet philosophical science, namely "the scientific standpoint", "Hegelian dialectics" and "Aristotelian realism". Mikulak, just as other bourgeois Marxologists, deludes himself with the hope that Soviet philosophical thought will "split up", that Marxism will "collapse" as a monistic system, and of course he presents this dream of his as something quite plausible.

Unfortunately these attempts to substantiate "pluralism" in Marxist philosophy and its "renaissance" through incorporation into contemporary socialist ideology of "elements of non-Marxist thought" do occasionally find response in certain socialist countries.**

Survey, 1964, No. 52, p. 156.

*: Incorrect revisionist views were propagated by the Czech philosopher Milan Průcha who echoed the assertions of bourgeois Marxologists to the effect that Marxism and its philosophy are "weakened by long sickness" and "ossified" and that this "ossification" must give way to a "renewal" of Marxism. (M. Průcha, "Der Marxismus und die Richtungen in der Philosophie", *Praxis*, 1967, No. 2)

Although Průcha claims to oppose the introduction of bourgeois ideology into the socialist countries, his thesis concerning the possibility of "freeing" the existentialist and anthropological ideas of bourgeois philosophy (Heidegger, Husserl, Teilhard de Chardin et al.) from their 'specific ideological context', i.e., separating them from bourgeois ideology and incorporating them in another, i.e., socialist "ideological context" holds no water. Průcha ignores the class, socialist character of Marxist philosophy and Marxist humanism, which approaches the problem of the emancipation of man and his happiness as something inseparably

Enemies of communism advocate amicable co-operation in the sphere of philosophy, art and culture as a whole, reckoning that this could lead to an erosion of socialist ideology: however they themselves by no means always believe in the success of their "deideologisation mission".

The notorious "Sovietologist" Klaus Mehnert in one of his recent works *Westerly Wind over Eastern Europe (Westwind über Osteuropa)* had to acknowledge, "For the moment the West for people outside it appears brimming over with the exciting and mysterious unknown, for people, many of whom are really tired of the grey reality of their everyday lives; everything unfamiliar thus appears to them colourful and attractive. If they get to know us better, they will experience a certain degree of disappointment; some of their illusions will be shattered and they will catch sight of certain problems with which we have already been grappling for a long time." Thus we must do all we can to "prepare ourselves better for intellectual and material competition with the Eastern world which is drawing ever nearer as the iron curtain grows less impenetrable".*

If we leave aside the old tale told by bourgeois reactionaries concerning the "iron curtain", it is clear that here one of the most skilful and experienced practitioners of the art of "Sovietology" among the opponents of Marxism-Leninism is giving voice to imperialist reaction's fear of the socialist world and the people that inhabit it, who, after giving careful thought to what they see, hear and know of the capitalist world, turn their backs on it once and for all. Other fears also haunt bourgeois advocates of ideological "peaceful co-existence" with regard to the future of bour-

linked with the class struggle of the proletariat and the construction of communism. This means that Průcha is really seeking to immerse socialist humanism and Marxist philosophy in bourgeois-liberal and idealist conceptions of the "individual" and "freedom" in general.

Průcha's advocacy of a "synthesis" of Marxism with "elements of non-Marxist thought" constitutes a departure from Marxism. It implies more than a dialogue with philosophers from a different camp (from the Church for example) and involves fraternisation with the latter, a transition to revisionist support for the reconciliation of socialist and bourgeois ideologies.

* K. Mehnert, "Westwind über Osteuropa", *Osteuropa*, 1966, Heft 1, S. 17.

geois ideology. The American sociologist Henry Aiken in his work *Revolt Against Ideology* raises the alarm in connection with the West's avowed course of "deideologisation" of philosophy, science and culture, anxious lest propagation of pluralism lead irrevocably to anarchism and nihilism in the bourgeois countries and to the spread of "pessimistic philosophy" in the "make-the-most-of-today" vein which would leave "us (i.e., bourgeois ideologists) helpless in the international struggle against communism".

Admissions of this type by bourgeois ideologists are by no means isolated occurrences. This however does not mean that bourgeois philosophy with all its trends, currents and nuances is not a hostile force to be reckoned with. It is still a powerful, crafty and highly influential enemy.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy cannot confine itself to mere definition of the basic trends in "criticism" of our philosophical doctrine and its history by bourgeois ideologists. The new stage in the criticism of our philosophical opponents must consist of a systematic scientific analysis and well-argued refutation of the "latest revelations" made by bourgeois and revisionist interpreters of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and a study of their evolution in the course of history and of contemporary bourgeois interpretations of the major problems in philosophy and sociology.

In recent years incorrect assertions about Leninism, its history and place in the history of philosophy quite at variance with the truth have appeared in certain foreign publications. In a number of cases Leninism has been represented as a "local" Russian or "Eastern" variant of Marxism applicable in the main to countries with a predominantly peasant population and lacking in strong democratic traditions, while it is alleged that for countries of Western and Central Europe, particularly the industrially developed ones, other "Western variants" of Marxism are required.

The revisionist Ernst Fischer for example in his book *Marx in His Own Words* writes that "proceeding from Marx's reflections Lenin adapted the theory of revolution to the particular problems of tsarist Russia" and Leninism he treats as an amalgamation of concepts and ideas held by "that group (the Bolsheviks) of which Lenin had been the leader within Russian social democracy and under whose

leadership the October Revolution of 1917 took place".* Unfortunately Ernst Fischer is not alone in his speculations regarding Leninism.

An erroneous interpretation of Lenin's work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and Lenin's creative role in Marxist philosophy is also found in an article by Comrade Umberto Cerroni, written on the occasion of the publication of the Volume 41 of Lenin's collected works in Italian. This author would have us believe that Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* is a work most controversial from a philosophical point of view. While recognising Lenin to be a political genius, Cerroni does not accept that Lenin's contribution to philosophy was one of genius, declaring that recognition of Lenin as a philosophical genius would be tantamount to a revival of Plato's requirement to the effect that philosophers take on themselves political leadership. Contenting himself with such cheap sophistry instead of giving a scientific analysis of Lenin's true contribution to the philosophy of Marx Cerroni thereby casts aspersions at Lenin's immortal *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and artificially separated Lenin's political activity from his philosophical views. Here again Cerroni departs from historical truth which in the past found such apt expression in the writings of Antonio Gramsci, the founder of the Italian Communist Party, who singled out the inseparable link between the development of Lenin's political theory and practical activity on the one hand, and his creative development of philosophy, on the other.**

Of late there has come to light a synthesis of the views held by revisionist elements in the communist movement and those of bourgeois Marxologists, who pick out specific aspects and propositions from Marxist teaching (for example those concerning the growing role of productive forces, technology and science in social development; the "alienation" of man's ontological forces and the desirability of their elimination, the changes in the social structure of society as a result of changes in the character of labour and

* E Fischer, *Was Marx wirklich sagte*, Wien-München-Zürich 1968, pp 157, 158.

** A Gramsci, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, p 5, Russ. ed.

improved educational levels, etc.) and present them in a bourgeois spirit, claiming that Marxist ideas can be implemented without any class struggle and socialist revolution in "industrial society". These conceptions of bourgeois ideologists are closely allied with revisionist advocacy of so-called "open Marxism" and "deideologisation" and "convergence" in the sphere of science and culture that has even found a hearing in some socialist countries. At the same time in the sphere of socio-philosophical thought the contradictory trends in the present period have made themselves felt in that both the opponents of Marxist philosophy and certain advocates of its "toning-down", who in word support Marxist philosophy but in practice confine it to the early stages of its development that are long since past and which they misinterpret, would deprive Marxist philosophy of its essential foundations and principles.

Ideologists of the liberal "Left" sections of the bourgeoisie and some eminent representatives of the world of science and art, who find "attractive elements" in Marxist philosophy direct their attacks mainly at Leninism, against the new contribution which has been made to Marxist philosophy by Lenin and Communists of the modern period. They are often all too eager to stress the need for a "renewal" of Marxism, for a "new reading" and "creative development" of its philosophy proposing in the place of Leninism an amalgamation of isolated fragments of Marxist teaching and their own idealist conceptions (Jean-Paul Sartre, Erich Fromm, Ernst Bloch, etc.).

An extremely aggressive position in relation to Leninism and present-day communism is taken up by "Left" extremists among bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists, in particular by those representatives of the bourgeois intelligentsia (such as Herbert Marcuse), who while denying the revolutionary role of the contemporary working class and Communist parties impress upon students and young people and petty bourgeois and declassé sections of the population, etc., adventurist ideas to the effect that the revolutionary historic mission of the proletariat has been passed on to them and that Marxism must assume a more "left", "activist" and "rebellious" form than that advocated by Leninism and supported today by Communist Parties.

In this way Marcuse and his ilk, ignoring the real state of affairs, reject Marxist-Leninist teaching with regard to the leading role of the working class in the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bourgeois "critics" of Marxism-Leninism utilise and blow up those mistakes, which were made in the past by certain Soviet writers (among both philosophers and scientists) in the assessment of various scientific discoveries and theories, in order to represent Marxist-Leninist materialist dialectics as an outdated unscientific method of no use to modern science and rejected by scientists even in the Soviet Union itself. The Catholic philosopher Guy Planty-Bonjour in his book *Categories of Dialectical Materialism* (published in the series *Sovetica* in 1965) maintained in defiance of historical truth that the "concept of dialectics is in no way linked with the concept of subjectivity; dialectics without subjectivity, dialectical materialism or dialectics without Logos, dialectical matter—that is the doctrine upheld by Soviet philosophers". He then proceeds to draw the outrageous and completely unjustified conclusion that "dialectical materialism of the present variety does not in the slightest degree act as a censor on scientific activity" and that in general "dialectical materialism has nothing to offer science being essentially contradictory and fatal for dialectics".

These assertions are shown up as groundless not only by the whole history of Marxist dialectics but also by present-day developments in society and science.

Similar falsifications by bourgeois ideologists concerning the withering away of dialectics in Marxism-Leninism and its inapplicability to modern science sometimes even penetrate the ranks of the labour movement.

This all accounts for the growing gulf between Communist Parties loyal to Leninism and various revisionist interpreters of Marxism, Right-wing "neo-Marxists" and "Left" revisionist extremists. In the *Central Committee Report to the 24th Congress of the CPSU* it was stated: "The struggle between the forces of capitalism and socialism on the world scene and the attempts of revisionists of all hues to

¹ G. Planty-Bonjour, *Les catégories du matérialisme dialectique L'ontologie soviétique contemporaine*, Dordrecht-Reidel, 1965, p. 8.

emasculate the revolutionary teaching and distort the practice of socialist and communist construction require that we continue to pay undivided attention to the problems and creative development of theory.”*

The present ideological struggle centred round topical questions of philosophy, to which with the help of Leninism it has been possible to find scientific and revolutionary answers, should be fully and comprehensively reflected in the research work of Marxist philosophers, including those specialising in the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. This branch of learning in its constant reference to the principles and traditions of the founders of dialectical materialism should incorporate the “quintessence” of our historical epoch, contemporary Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Marxist philosophy of today in the USSR and abroad carries forward the traditions of Marxism-Leninism, enriches philosophical knowledge and arms those striving toward the final victory of communism and the communist world outlook with a science-based understanding of the laws and prospects of social development and with a dialectical method for the cognition and revolutionary transformation of the world.

2. ACHIEVEMENTS, PROBLEMS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS OF RESEARCH INTO THE HISTORY OF MARXIST-LENINIST PHILOSOPHY

Marxist philosophy and social sciences since the October Revolution has been enriched by hundreds of joint publications and monographs shedding light on the historical course of Marxism-Leninism in the sphere of philosophy, political economy, scientific communism and various social sciences.** In the 1960s and early seventies scholarly biographies of Marx, Engels and Lenin, put out by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the CPSU, represented an achievement of considerable significance for research into the history of Marxism. Conferences were held to

* 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, p. 123

** See the Bibliography in *The History of Philosophy*, Vol. IV, Moscow, 1949, pp. 579-650 and Vol VI, Part 2, Moscow, 1965, pp. 474-525 (in Russian).

discuss questions connected with the history of Marxism-Leninism (in the USSR and abroad) on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution, the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth, the centenary of Lenin's birth and the 150th anniversary of Engels' birth.

In the course of the last 10-15 years a large number of scientific works, monographs and manuals providing wide-range surveys of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy have been published in the Soviet Union and other countries: they bring us a vivid and complete picture of the emergence and development of communist philosophy and the struggle it wages against bourgeois ideologies.*

Thanks to this work carried out by Soviet and other researchers important fundamental conclusions and tenets in the field of the history of Marxist philosophy have been convincingly substantiated and become an accepted fact of socio-political science. Here we list some of the most important:

the process of the formation of Marxism constitutes a revolution in philosophy, which is the outcome of earlier development in philosophy and at the same time its negation, the critical reworking of valuable achievements in philosophical and social thought; the erroneous idea that the philosophy of Marxism is the result of a mere amalgamation of earlier ideas, a synthesis of Hegelian dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism has been refuted;

* See *The History of Philosophy*, in six volumes Vol. 3-6, Moscow, 1959-65 (in Russian); *Marx's "Capital" and Philosophy Today*, Moscow, 1968 (in Russian); *Short Survey of the History of Philosophy*, Second ed., Moscow, 1971 (in Russian); *Lenin and Science of Today*, in two volumes, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian); *Lenin and Contemporary Sciences*, Moscow, 1969 (in Russian); *Lenin's Theory of Reflection and the Modern World*, Sofia, 1969, Bulg. ed. (in Russian); *Marxist-Leninist Philosophy and Sociology in the USSR and European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian); *Modern Philosophy and Sociology in West Europe and the Americas*, Moscow, 1964 (in Russian); L. Sève, *La philosophie française contemporaine et sa genèse de 1789 à nos jours*, Paris, 1962; A. Bankov, *The Development of Philosophical Thought in Bulgaria*, Sofia, 1966, Bulg. ed.; H. Glockner, *Das Auentuer des Geistes*, Stuttgart, 1947; *Istoria gândirii sociale și filozofice în România*, București, 1964, Rom ed.; J. Schleifstein, *Franz Mehring Sein Weg zum Marxismus, 1819-1891*, Berlin, 1958; J. Schleifstein, *Franz Mehring Sein marxistisches Schaffen 1891-1919*, Berlin, 1959; *Zum Geschichte der marxistisch-leninistischen Philosophie in Deutschland*, Bd. I, 1-2, Berlin, 1969, etc

a scientific periodisation has been drawn up for the history of Marxism and its philosophy which basically corresponds to the main periods in the history of society and the revolutionary labour movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries:

research has been carried out into the historic course of Marxist philosophy—of dialectical materialism—which at the various stages of its history has been creatively developed and changing its form, enriching and concretising its content on the basis of generalised analysis of the new content of social experience and achievements of the revolutionary movement and science; the continuity in the development of dialectical materialism at all stages of its history has been singled out;

it has been demonstrated that the development of dialectical and historical materialism as the philosophical basis of the scientific world outlook of the international communist movement is inseparably linked up with that of the other component parts of Marxism—political economy and scientific communism, on the findings of which Marxist philosophy is based and for which Marxist philosophy in its turn provides the ideological and methodological foundation;

the history of Marxist philosophy in the light of this research is viewed as a developing entity, combining the dialectical-materialist interpretation of the world and materialist dialectics providing a methodology of cognition and revolutionary action, which together make up the integral scientific and philosophical world outlook of Marxism directed against the idealism and metaphysics of bourgeois philosophy and Right and “Left” revisionism that are ideologically speaking closely related to the former;

it has been demonstrated that since the mid-nineties of the last century Marxism and its philosophy entered a new, Leninist stage of development which started in the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and is continuing and developing in the new historical epoch ushered in by the victory of the October Socialist Revolution of 1917;

investigation of the dissemination and development of Marxist philosophical thought in various countries of East and West have become an accepted scientific activity at the present time in the socialist world, in the capitalist countries

and those of the "Third World", i.e., countries that have liberated themselves from imperialist exploitation and the developing countries. This serves to demonstrate the international character of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and vindicate the Marxist thesis regarding the international content of the historico-philosophical process particularly at its present stage. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is viewed as the ideological and methodological foundation of the international culture of socialism and communism;

the research work carried out by Marxist historians of philosophy elucidates the essential features and laws governing the historical course of development of Marxist philosophy, the unity of its structure and functions, the continuity in its historical development: the fundamental philosophical problems are singled out and it is shown how these problems are solved by Marxism-Leninism differently from the way they are resolved by contemporary bourgeois philosophy;

it is pointed out how in the course of history, particularly at the present time, major philosophical problems are solved with reference to dialectical and historical materialism through examination of the objective laws of the development of nature, society and thought and through definition on this strictly scientific basis of the active role of man, his practical activity and consciousness in the revolutionary, communist transformation of the world; the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy emerges as a developing entity incorporating scientific theory, a methodology of revolutionary initiative and the ideals of communist humanism;

investigation of the history of dialectics as Marxist logic and theory of cognition sheds light on the process of development and enrichment of the concepts and categories of dialectical materialism and on its growing role in contemporary scientific cognition.

As a result of these achievements in the sphere of philosophy Marxist science is able to refute the fabrications of bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists and incorrect interpretations of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and to demonstrate that over the 125 years that have elapsed since its emergence dialectical and historical materialism, despite certain deviations and errors in the philosophical writings of the supporters of Marxism at various periods of

its development, has been and remains a viable and creative philosophy, genuinely scientific, revolutionary and optimistic in character, the international teaching of the revolutionary proletariat, progressive scientists and men of letters throughout the world.

Lenin always urged that we should not be content with results already achieved in the sphere of knowledge. He considered that the best way to celebrate our country's October Revolution was to turn attention to tasks still outstanding. This behest of Lenin's is most relevant in relation to the history of Marxist philosophy. The history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is a relatively young science that came into being at the turn of the century, but which only came to be treated as an independent scientific discipline separate from the overall range of Marxist research into the history of philosophy some fifteen to twenty years ago. Despite the undeniable topicality of the problems facing Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the growing interest shown in its findings both by Soviet and foreign Marxists many aspects of this science are only now being investigated for the first time. So far, apart from Vols. III-VI of the Soviet *History of Philosophy* there are not yet any fundamental comprehensive works on the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy covering the development of this philosophy in various countries of the world and various aspects of philosophical knowledge. Works are now being prepared on the history of dialectics in Marxist-Leninist philosophy but the history of Marxist sociology, Marxist ethics and the ideas of communist humanism in Marxist-Leninist teaching have yet to be subjected to profound and scientific analysis.

A number of fundamental problems confront Marxist-Leninist philosophers including those engaged in research into the history of Marxism, and these include certain contradictions encountered in the development of Marxist theory at the present stage of its development.

Given the complex conditions stemming from uneven social, ideological and theoretical development in various countries political leaders can appear in countries advancing towards socialism or embarked on the path of non-capitalist development who show interest in socialism or even have socialist leanings, who wish to become Marxists but who

have not yet mastered Leninist ideas and method or who do not yet accept certain of Lenin's tenets. In the present historical period progressive scientists and sociologists come to embrace Marxist philosophy in view of the fact that the general development discernible in their fields of science leads them to accept dialectical materialism while they are not yet supporting the policy of the Communist parties or at least not participating in the activities of those parties. Nowadays it is possible to encounter certain academics, including philosophers who have come to support dialectical materialism but fail to proceed from there to the necessary ideological, theoretical and political conclusions, fail to go as far as Leninist commitment in philosophy. It would be premature and in some cases even dangerous to consider all those people who embrace certain Marxist philosophical ideas as champions of Leninism or its representatives. At the same time it would be incorrect to "cut off" from Marxist philosophy the scientists and politicians from the non-socialist countries who are coming round to the Marxist point of view, to obstruct the further advance of their ideas and their transition to a consistent Marxist, Leninist standpoint. It is a quite different matter of course when we are up against those who call themselves philosophical Marxists but in practice openly or indirectly oppose the principles of Leninism—the creative Marxism of the twentieth century—who come out against the ideology and policies of the Communist parties and deliberately work to promote rapprochement or even the unnatural "integration" of Marxism and various manifestations of the bourgeois world outlook. While the first group is advancing towards Marxism-Leninism, to its philosophy from a non-Marxist world outlook, the second, on the contrary, is departing from Marxism at its highest level, the achievement of Leninism, reverting in word to the initial stages of Marxism and in practice to the contemporary bourgeois outlook disguised in Marxist verbiage.

From this situation stems one of the most important tasks facing those engaged in research into Marxist-Leninist philosophy, namely to trace the evolution of the philosophical ideas complete with all their contradictions and twists and turns expressed by leading figures in the field of political thought and science who have come to accept or are in the

process of embracing dialectical materialism but who have not progressed as far as Leninist philosophy and politics. An equally important task facing the historians of Marxist philosophy is the elucidation of the departure from a number of Marxism and its philosophy can provide adequate scientific Marxist philosophers, who under the influence of opportunism or other socio-political factors have abandoned, to varying extents, these principles and strayed from the main path of the advance of Marxist philosophy as represented by Leninism. In the present period Leninism constitutes a truly scientific and consistently revolutionary and creatively developing philosophy, while no other "variants" or "versions" of Marxism and its philosophy can provide adequate scientific answers to burning questions of philosophy and sociology.

In the struggle against bourgeois and revisionist Marxology with regard to questions of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy particular attention is devoted to the historical fate of Marxism, its philosophy and sociology. This question is widely discussed in foreign publications of a bourgeois and revisionist slant ranging from the weekly *Studies in Soviet Thought* put out by Joseph Bocheński and Professor Pitirim Sorokin's book *The Basic Trends of Our Times* (1964) to Ernst Fischer's book *What Marx Really Said* (1968) and the theses put forward by the Zagreb professor, Predrag Vranicki, at the 14th International Philosophical Congress in Vienna.

Many bourgeois Marxologists and revisionist philosophers whose work has much in common with that of the former, such as Predrag Vranicki, see the future of Marxism . . . to lie in a departure beyond the confines of Marxism with the help of Marx himself. Supporters of "integration" held by bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, such as Pitirim Sorokin, set their hopes on philosophy, sociology and theoretical research in the USSR losing their party commitment, their irreconcilable attitude to the West and its ideology and their "ideological nature" and thus drawing nearer and eventually merging completely with Western philosophical and social theories. Sorokin for one wrote: "...if mankind avoids new world wars and can overcome today's grave emergencies, the dominant type of the emerging society and culture is likely to be neither capitalistic nor communistic, but a type *sui*

generis which we can designate as *an integral type*. This type will be intermediary between the capitalist and Communist orders and ways of life. It is going to incorporate most of the positive values and to be free from the serious defects of each type".*

The hopes entertained by Sorokin and other bourgeois Marxologists to the effect that idealist and materialist trends will converge to constitute a "middle integrated philosophical standpoint" are not destined to bear fruit, although the advocates of "convergence" and "integration", who are sometimes to be encountered even in the socialist countries, in the future will be utilising all "channels" to try and realise their impracticable goal of ideological and philosophical rapprochement between the worlds of socialism and capitalism.

Facts relating to the contemporary advance of science and philosophical theory illustrate how despite the considerable significance ascribed to structural analysis, mathematical and cybernetic methods, etc., that are now made wide use of, the latter cannot provide universal philosophical methods of cognition and replace the method of materialist dialectics that has proved itself in both science and revolutionary practice. The future of Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not lie in its adaptation to the specific empirical methods of individual sciences or in the "liberation" of the logic of cognition from the principles of cognition rooted in the world outlook underlying it, but in the all-round creative elaboration of dialectical-materialist philosophical methodology and logic of cognition in conjunction with the wide utilisation of specific methods employed in science. Those engaged in research into the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy will need to define the correlation between the universal philosophical method of materialist dialectics and specific scientific methods, particularly the most modern, including those which are applicable to many branches of knowledge.

The historic future of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which is destined to become and, according to the profound belief entertained by Communists, is bound to become the theoretical basis of the world outlook of all mankind, will not

* P. Sorokin, *The Basic Trends of Our Times*, New Haven, 1964, p 78

consist in a splitting up into national schools nor in "pluralist diversity" but will see international co-operation and agreement in scientific and philosophical thought throughout the world.

Thus an analysis of the history of Marxist philosophy and consideration of its future prospects lead to the conclusion that the hopes entertained by bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists that a "convergence" or "integration" of Marxist philosophy and non-Marxist thought will take place are illusory and ill-founded and spur us on to campaign consistently to uphold the pure and creative development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the philosophy of the future.

The researchers concerned with the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy are faced by a good deal of as yet unanswered questions and there are mistakes and oversimplifications in this field to be eradicated. In the Soviet press it has been pointed out that detailed scientific research into the history of Marxist philosophy was frequently impeded by too wide an understanding of its subject, as a result of which the philosophical ideas of Marxism were treated as merely a part of the history of socio-political thought or part of the history of science. The scientific and theoretical level of research into the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as an independent branch of science sometimes sank to no more than a descriptive or purely chronological study and this meant that the philosophical problems which appeared or were taking shape in the course of the history of Marxism were not always singled out. An extension of the range of research into the history of Marxist philosophy was not helped by the fact that in the past due attention was not paid to contemporary Marxist philosophy abroad and to the criticism of bourgeois and revisionist distortions of the history of Marxist philosophy.

Soviet philosophers have brought out a series of works on the role of Leninism in the advance of contemporary philosophy providing a short account of the basic features of the Leninist stage in the history of Marxist philosophy and shedding light on topical issues and their solution with the help of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the USSR and other countries. The series included the following books: *Lenin as Philosopher*, *Leninism and Philosophical Problems of Today*,

Lenin and Contemporary Science, *Leninism and Contemporary Issues of the History of Philosophy*, and *Lenin's Theory of Reflection and the Modern World* published in Russian by a team of Bulgarian and Soviet philosophers in Bulgaria. Another recent joint republication was *Engels and Contemporary Questions of Marxist Philosophy* contributed to by GDR and Soviet philosophers. In 1970 a collection of articles was published under the title *Leninism and the Development of Contemporary Marxist Philosophy Abroad*, in which Soviet philosophers drew attention to the role of other Marxists in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and revisionism and in the elaboration of strategic and tactical problems confronting the international communist movement. These works by Soviet and foreign Marxist philosophers mark the beginning of wide-scale systematic research to be conducted in the near future into the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

The historical path traversed by Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy, the lessons to be drawn from its development that are relevant to the modern situation must now be subjected to comprehensive research and systematised in major research writings. A number of academic works by Soviet philosophers will be devoted to the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, its creative development in the context of the world communist movement and its struggle against bourgeois philosophy and various forms of revisionism. Work has been completed on Volume V of *The History of Philosophy* which provides interesting insight into the history of Marxist philosophy in Russia and its development since the October Revolution in Soviet society.

Proposals have recently been put forward to the effect that a general comprehensive survey of the history of Marxism-Leninism be drawn up on the basis of research conducted by historians of philosophy and economic and political teachings, proposals which deserve serious consideration and support. Plans have been drawn up for the publication of a number of monographs and popular studies of the main periods in the history of Marxist philosophy and its most eminent representatives, on the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the Soviet Union and abroad. Among the aspects of the history of Marxist philosophy which have

as yet been inadequately studied and the examination of which assumes paramount importance, in view of the present ideological struggle and the requirements of modern science, the history of materialist dialectics as the logic and theory of cognition and the methodology of the revolutionary transformation of the world is one of the most vital. Scientific institutions and university faculties engaged in philosophical research in our country have considerable responsibilities to the ideological front that have not yet been shouldered: work has been proceeding extremely slowly on the tasks outlined by Lenin such as the elaboration of the history of dialectics, the publication of works on the history of dialectics, including Marxist-Leninist dialectics.*

In future research into the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy a central place should be accorded to the analysis of the development of the ideas of communist humanism, the elaboration and solution of the problem of man in the process of the historical development of the communist movement. Although the problems of Marxist humanism—man as an individual, the world of men's intellectual and moral experience, the all-round development of the individual—have recently been the subject of increased attention on the part of Soviet philosophers, research into these problems from the angle of the history of philosophy is still at an embryonic stage. New highly systematic research is required not only in order to refute the fabrications of bourgeois and revisionist Marxologists to the effect that contemporary Marxism-Leninism remains indifferent to the problems of man and supposedly ignores it, but more important still in order to provide a positive elaboration of humanist problems, as treated in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, so that the latter may

* In an article entitled *Lenin's Theoretical Elaboration of Materialist Dialectics* on Lenin's programme for the analysis of dialectics as the summing-up and final conclusion to be drawn from the history of cognition, B. M. Kedrov aptly pointed out: "In our philosophical literature so far only first steps have been taken in an attempt to trace the coincidence of historical and logical elements in the investigation of the history of individual sciences. Taken all in all, this task outlined by Lenin has not been completed. Only of late has the importance of its accomplishment in relation to elaboration of the history of dialectics come to be acknowledged." (B. Kedrov, *The Subject and Interrelation of Natural Sciences*, Moscow, 1962, p. 80, in Russian).

play a more significant role in the life of society as a whole and that of the individual. Such research could serve to demonstrate the superiority of Marxist humanism over all types of limited bourgeois humanism and pseudo-humanism, its viable realism and tremendous potential for the future.

Soviet and foreign Marxists also need to embark on wider research into the history of Marxist philosophical ideas with regard to the development of society and various aspects of social life, i.e., the history of sociological, ethical and aesthetic ideas contained in Marxist theory, the development of Marxist ideas on the "philosophy of history", which are often merely referred to in general terms in works on the history of Marxist philosophy.

Soviet philosophers ought also to go out of their way to ensure that questions connected with the history of philosophical teachings on society and man be accorded due attention in their research studies and university philosophy curricula, particularly those in philosophy faculties.

Research into the history of Marxist philosophy in the USSR and the history of Soviet philosophical science as a whole that has been undertaken in recent years in our leading academic centres, including those in a number of Union Republics has found expression so far mainly in the publication of books of a popular-scientific level and manuals. So far, with the exception of Volume VI of *The History of Philosophy* there do not exist any fundamental studies of the history of Soviet philosophical science, which are essential both for the exposure of the falsifications to be found in bourgeois and revisionist "Sovietology" and for the ideological and political grounding in Marxism-Leninism and the patriotic education of the younger generation. This is a question of particular relevance in view of the fact that efforts on the part of bourgeois philosophers to denigrate the historical advance of Marxist-Leninist theory, particularly in connection with the period 1930-1950, far from ceasing have on the contrary intensified of late and false groundless hypotheses concerning the "stagnation" of Soviet philosophical science, depicting the role of Soviet philosophy in science and culture in a highly negative light, are proliferating.

In recent years more attention has been devoted by Soviet philosophers to the history of Marxist philosophy outside

their own country and to the contemporary problems facing Marxist philosophy, and more information has been made available on the works of Marxist philosophers from abroad and on their role in the struggle against bourgeois ideology. However the resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the CPSU (August 1967) concerning the further development of the social sciences and the enhancement of their role in communist construction, and calling among other things for all-round investigation of Marxist thought abroad has not met with anything like adequate response. Considerable effort is now required to ensure the enrichment of Soviet science with fundamental investigations of the historical experience, traditions and contemporary trends of development in Marxist thought abroad. All these problems merit study and scientific analysis of an extent comparable to those devoted to the history of pre-Marxist philosophy of East and West.

Marxist philosophers rightly consider that the most effective means of exposing bourgeois philosophy and criticising revisionist distortions of Marxism and falsifications and misinterpretations of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, is a creative positive elaboration of topical issues in the sphere of philosophy, society and science, including those which are the subject of research and misrepresentation in various trends of bourgeois philosophy and sociology. However, the accomplishment of this task, the positive elaboration of topical problems of philosophy, does not exclude but instead presupposes the need for a comprehensive and well-argued scientific and critical analysis of contemporary conceptions found in bourgeois and revisionist philosophy and interpretation of the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Those who consider that the time when the need to devote whole philosophical tomes to the critical refutation of the output of falsifiers of Marxism and its philosophy is past are profoundly mistaken. Sometimes people would have us believe that there is no longer any need to follow the tradition started in Engels' *Anti-Dühring* and Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* so as to unmask pseudo-philosophy and attempts to infiltrate into the labour movement and research all manner of bourgeois trash. In actual fact a comprehensive and detailed study and evaluation of numerous philosophical trends, especially those which constitute "imitations" of Marx-

ism and the refutation of revisionist claims to the effect that it is precisely they who are producing creative philosophy are vitally important now as ever. For the international ideological and philosophical struggle, for the scientific elaboration of the history of Marxist philosophy, it is vital to produce academic studies, directed against Marcuse, Fromm, Bloch and Mao, for example, providing a scientifically argued exposition of the concepts now most widespread in anti-Leninist schools of philosophical and social thought, claiming to be engaged in the "creative development" and "renewal" of Marxism.*

Systematic scientific research into the history of Marxist philosophy and socio-political thought, and cogently argued criticism and exposure of the enemies of Marxism past and present, closely related to the creative elaboration of the fundamental philosophical problems of the present must be given a new lease of life and attain a higher scientific level worthy of the eternally viable and creatively developing philosophy of Marxism-Leninism.

* In his absorbing book entitled *Problems of the History of Philosophy* T. I. Oizerman puts forward convincing criticism of a number of attempts to "renew" Marxist philosophy by means of "pluralist" conceptions alien to the spirit of Leninism. In his criticism of Vranicki, in particular the latter's theses under the heading *The Need for a Number of Variants of Marxist Philosophy* presented at the 14th International Philosophical Congress, Oizerman drew the following apt conclusion "There cannot be any variety of (scientific) variants of the scientific-philosophical world outlook, just as there cannot be variants for any scientific theory." In his exposition of Vranick's assertions and those of other self-styled "renewers" of Marxism implying that Marxist philosophy can only be philosophy but not a science, Oizerman demonstrated that "in our age the only adequate form for theoretical truth is science, scientific research. Consequently this would imply that philosophy should not strive after objective truth, i.e., truth independent of the mind of the philosopher? But then philosophy would cease to be theoretical knowledge and we would be left with nothing but consciousness, consciousness bereft of knowledge" (T. Oizerman, *Problems of the History of Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973).

CONCLUSION

The period of the development of Marxist philosophy and social thought in the Soviet Union and in the world communist movement, extremely short from a historical point of view, has sufficed to vindicate the force and viability of Leninism, including Leninist traditions in philosophy.

Prior to the construction of socialism in the USSR the development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and theory proceeded in the tense and difficult context of opposition to the vestiges and influences of the world outlook of the bourgeoisie, that had been overthrown but still made its presence felt, opposition to philosophical and sociological conceptions that were opportunist and alien to socialism (undisguised idealism of the reactionary philosophers, religious-philosophical trends, Bogdanov's subjectivist "tektology", Trotskyism with its "Leftist" voluntaristic principles, Right-wing opportunism with its mechanistic theory of equilibrium, bourgeois-nationalist theories, etc.).

The irreconcilable struggle between the socialist and bourgeois world outlook within the Soviet Union, which after the construction of socialism in the USSR ended in an indisputable victory for the socialist world outlook, far from weakening or impoverishing philosophical knowledge, as bourgeois "Sovietologists" would have us believe, facilitated the profound and fruitful solution of a number of important philosophical questions connected with social development. These include questions connected with the active influence of consciousness upon social reality, the interrelation of the mas-

ses and the individual, forecasting paths and prospects for the advance towards socialism, etc., and also questions connected with the advance of scientific thought 'the establishment of firm links between materialist philosophy and natural science, ways to surmount the crisis in the natural sciences, the correlation between dialectical and formal logic, etc.).

In the USSR new branches of scientific knowledge grew up which had been completely or almost unknown in pre-revolutionary Russia (dialectical logic, the history of the philosophy of science, the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the history of philosophy of the peoples of the USSR, the philosophical theory of scientific communism, the theory and history of atheism, etc.). Traditional branches of philosophical knowledge in their turn were enriched by the incorporation of new problems and their solutions, by new concepts and propositions, branches of philosophical thought that had been developing in pre-revolutionary Russia but which had been essentially idealist and the terrain of an extremely narrow circle of "professionals" (gnoseology, formal logic, the general philosophical theory in psychology, sociology, aesthetics, the history of world philosophy, the history of Russian philosophy, to name but a few).

There was no trace of stagnation, immobility, the absence of collisions and clashes of opinions in philosophy in socialist society, which had asserted itself in the USSR and when the bourgeois idealist world outlook had in the main been ousted from the field of philosophy and sociology despite the assertions of bourgeois interpreters of Soviet philosophical thought. In reality the struggle between the new and the old, between progressive and backward ideas, between the materialist world outlook and vestiges of religious and other non-scientific attitudes was constantly at work within Soviet society. In addition philosophical thought in the USSR, contrary to the assertions of bourgeois "Sovietologists", is developing not in isolation from the rest of the world but as an inseparable part of the general development of international Marxist philosophical thought, which never for a moment abandons its struggle against reactionary and bourgeois ideology in connection with fundamental philosophical questions. Further, the fact that the struggle between different

world outlooks within the country has been giving way increasingly, since the victory of socialist society to a struggle of opinions in the field of science, to the contrasting of various scientific points of view on the basis of the overall Marxist-Leninist world outlook, does not imply in the least that any "unification" or "levelling-out" is taking place. Fierce discussions, particularly in the fifties and sixties, developed around problems of philosophy, sociology, aesthetics, ethics and other aspects of philosophical knowledge and these were taken part in by many Soviet people who were not professional philosophers. Scientific schools are growing up, and ever new teams of scientists are engaging in the elaboration, on a foundation of Marxism-Leninism, of philosophical, sociological and other theoretical problems. A number of new fields and offshoots of philosophical science (in the sphere of logic, psychology, sociology, aesthetics, scientific communism, etc.) are branching out. Polemics concerning methodological questions in the natural sciences, mathematics, cybernetics and the humanities proceed with unabated momentum.

The profound and comprehensive assimilation of man's heritage of philosophical thought, its scientific assessment and critical appraisal that it provides is another example of how the development of philosophical thought is being promoted on the basis of Leninist traditions. However much bourgeois falsifiers of Marxism contrive to represent Marxist philosophy as the enemy of the European cultural heritage and philosophical traditions,* these schemes of theirs, like many others, end in fiasco. Precisely Marxist-Leninist philosophy has demonstrated in practice exemplary respect for the philosophical heritage of the past. In the USSR and a number of other socialist countries (Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland, Rumania, etc.) scientific investigation and the publication and popularisation of philosophical teachings of the past from

* Heinrich Falk for example presents the situation in such a way as to imply that communist ideology represents "a profound negation of the whole vast sum of knowledge and concepts accumulated over almost two thousand years of cultural development" and that this ideology as such is merely "a means for changing the world, a weapon for capturing men's minds and placing them at the service of ideologists". (H. Falk, *Die ideologischen Grundlagen des Kommunismus*, München, 1961, S. 12, 24)

classical times to the present day have been organised on an unprecedented scale.

A profound knowledge of the intellectual achievements that have accumulated in the course of the historical development of philosophy has greatly extended the scope of philosophical activity and led to a marked improvement in the standard of philosophical research in this country; before the revolution the number of professional philosophers did not even reach a hundred, but now there is an enormous number of highly qualified experts in all fields of philosophical knowledge who have a competent command of contemporary philosophical science.

The history of Soviet philosophical science also provides an instructive example of the fruitful continuation and development of the Leninist tradition of the firm alliance between materialist philosophy and natural science. Lenin pointed out on a number of occasions that powerful currents radiate from natural science to the social sciences encouraging us to investigate the laws of development to be discerned in natural history, and that every new epoch-making discovery in natural science involves a change in the form of materialist philosophy. As a result of the implementation of Lenin's ideas, as expounded in his work *On the Significance of Militant Materialism* calling for an alliance between materialist philosophy and natural science, made possible thanks to the joint efforts of Marxist philosophers and scientists in the USSR, many works have been published dealing with philosophical and methodological aspects of science (physics, astronomy, chemistry, biology, mathematics, cybernetics, psychology, etc.). This did away with the former wide gulf between the fields of natural science and social cognition, between abstract-speculative philosophical conceptions and specific experimental sciences. Prerequisites are taking shape for a synthesis of scientific knowledge, a theoretical summing-up of achievements in the fields of both natural science and the social sciences. In Soviet social studies thanks to such a synthesis and in keeping with the principles of dialectical materialism it has been possible to do away with the false conceptions held by a number of scholars and thinkers in the capitalist countries up until the present day to the effect that natural science is primarily concerned with the descri-

tion and analysis of the laws of nature, while social sciences allegedly do not single out any laws in rapidly changing social reality and are concerned only with subjective assessments of various social and intellectual values. In singling out the objective laws of development and revolutionary change in economics, the social structure, political organisation and intellectual life of society, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, in close alliance with natural and social sciences, creates the prerequisites necessary for the creation of the first comprehensive scientific picture of the world, for the all-round philosophical interpretation of the external world and social being in the context of men's practical activity.

In the history of Soviet science and philosophical thought there occurred various departures from the Leninist tradition of consolidation of the alliance between natural science and philosophy. These found expression for instance in the fact that certain scientists and philosophers failing to reach a correct understanding and philosophical interpretation of various scientific achievements (Einstein's theory of relativity, discoveries in the field of cybernetics, achievements in genetics, mathematical methods and their application in natural and social sciences, etc.) started to equate the positive content of these scientific theories and methods with the bourgeois idealist interpretations they were given, as a result of which they came forward with a negative assessment of these scientific achievements that was to prove detrimental for scientific and philosophical knowledge and for their practical application. Errors committed by certain philosophers and scientists who did not keep abreast with modern science and applied to the field of science methods of administration held back the advance of scientific and philosophical research. Nevertheless the Leninist tradition in this sphere was kept alive and emerged victorious in the end. As a result of the efforts by the CPSU to eliminate the consequences of the personality cult and subjectivism the Leninist tradition of a close alliance between natural science and Marxist philosophy was reinstated, negative assessments of scientific discoveries were subjected to searching criticism and likewise distortions and mistakes in certain spheres of learning (for example, the vulgarised "theories" and incorrect methods of the Lysenko group in biology, erroneous attitudes to cyber-

netics and attacks against the application of mathematical methods in economics, etc.). This opened up wide scope for creative searchings in all spheres of science and for their philosophical elucidation.

Taken all in all in the light of historical experience in the advance of Soviet science, as is witnessed by a number of its most eminent representatives (V. A. Ambartsumyan, P. K. Anokhin, A. I. Berg, B. E. Bykhovsky, N. P. Dubinin, M. V. Keldysh, N. N. Semyonov, V. A. Fok, V. N. Chernigovsky et al.) dialectical materialism provides a true compass for the advance of sciences and vital philosophical equipment for scientists from all manner of fields.

Thanks to the implementation of Lenin's behest calling for a close alliance between natural sciences and materialist philosophy and the successes scored in the socialist cultural revolution first in the USSR, and later in the other socialist countries, the scientific materialist-atheist world outlook is asserting itself, and religious creeds, prejudices and superstitions are being ousted. In the fifty odd years that Soviet society has existed, and in particular since the victory of socialism in the USSR, the social base of religious ideology has been narrowed down considerably and this process continues. The historic programme for scientific-atheist propaganda first outlined in 1922 by Lenin in his article *On the Significance of Militant Materialism* is being put into practice including Lenin's appeal for wide reference to the materialist and atheistic traditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Opportunities for moulding society's scientific world outlook have in recent decades been enhanced by new achievements in modern science stemming from the technological revolution which is continually divulging the "secrets" of nature. At the present time the scientific world outlook is gaining ever new ground thanks to successes scored in natural and social sciences and technology, to the introduction of infinitely complex control and information systems and precise scientific methods in many spheres. This also serves to narrow down the sphere of influence of all non-scientific world outlooks (although this influence has by no means been done away with altogether) and to enhance the role of science in the intellectual life of society as a whole. The USSR has become a country of mass-scale atheism, al-

though religious prejudices and superstitions have not yet been eradicated from the minds of a certain, by no means negligible, section of society. Many years of systematic enlightenment cultural and socio-political campaigning are still required before religious and other backward ideas and habits are finally ousted from the psychology and life of the whole people, in which they had been rooted for centuries. Comrade Leonid Brezhnev has every justification for asserting "Lenin's prediction of a future alliance of the working class and the representatives of science and technology, which 'no dark force can withstand', as Lenin put it, has come true".

As a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the implementation of Lenin's behests in the sphere of science and culture, this particular Leninist tradition relevant to this aspect of social life has indisputably taken root, and the findings of scientific knowledge in the field of the natural and social sciences and technology have generated various significant processes now at work in society. The unprecedented improvement in the educational and cultural level and technical qualifications of tens of millions of manual workers, the formation of an intelligentsia consisting of several million former workers and peasants have made possible the emergence of a new, infinitely higher level of aspirations in the sphere of culture and science, including philosophy. While during the period of socialist construction it was possible to satisfy the intellectual demands of the Soviet population and their interests concerning questions of world outlook with more or less systematic, popular expositions of the ideas implicit in dialectical and historical materialism, by the fifties and sixties on the other hand these intellectual demands had become infinitely more complex and changed beyond recognition. Many new social and philosophical problems had emerged, in particular those connected with the contemporary scientific and technological revolution and its social consequences, the problem of the general laws and features of the advance of various countries to socialism, that of the interrelation between internationalism and the national self-awareness of formerly oppressed peoples, etc. These problems

* L. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1972, p. 271.

demand new philosophical and sociological solutions of a variety which could not have been provided earlier in Marxist philosophical writings. New methods of scientific thought are also taking shape in the sphere of social thought stemming from mathematical logic, cybernetics and other branches of new knowledge.

The introduction of mathematical, statistical and other quantitative methods, the introduction of computers and cybernetic installations in the sphere of economics, sociology, archaeology, linguistics and social science shape the future of these sciences when they will be based more and more on precise scientific methods that are already used on a wide scale in the natural sciences and technology. In the field of social thought (for example, for the preparation and implementation of the new economic reform, the transfer to a five-day working week and the selection of ways and methods for linking up technical training with general educational subjects, etc.) the "social experiment" is being adopted on an ever wider scale, employing the experimental methods that have been perfected and developed in research and technology.

In this connection erroneous ideas are often put forward to the effect that dialectics—the universal philosophical method of thought—might be replaced in Marxist philosophy and sociology by quite different methods (such as the structuralist method, for instance), likewise assertions regarding the possibility of "deideologising" philosophy and sociology, an idea which certain bourgeois and revisionist ideologists attempt to thrust upon the socialist world.

A question that is now very much in the centre of attention is that concerning the diversity and wealth of the intellectual experience of modern man, who is unable to confine his interests in matters of world outlook and philosophy to well-known, basically correct but already obsolescent interpretations of traditional philosophical problems, to content himself with superficial acquaintance with the results of the struggle between the diametrically opposed materialist and idealist world outlooks relating to the past. In this age characterised by rapid, dynamic developments in science, technology, social advance, man, who is now exposed to a tremendous volume of information and particularly man in the

socialist world, destined to be creator and master of the society in which he lives, seeks from philosophy a bolder and consistent fulfilment of its heuristic role—new discoveries, new theories and hypotheses, new lines of argument, new solutions for traditional and emergent philosophical problems. The philosophy of dialectical materialism and its method are essentially alien to all stagnation and limitation, they never should, or indeed can, rest content with that which has already been discovered and attained and come to a standstill, confine themselves to mere assimilation of the heritage of the past or a simple repetition of past traditions. The contemporary development of Marxist philosophy is characterised by resolute negation of dogmatism and uncritical pedantry and also of revisionist vacillations including pseudo-innovation, romantic dilettantism that “liberate” philosophy from the need to seriously concern itself with modern science, from the logical “processing” of the enormous volume of information to which man is exposed and shift that task onto either the sciences or cybernetic installations.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy pays particular attention to the growing intellectual interests and demands of the working man at the present time and in particular the rich and diverse interests and aspirations of the builder of communism who not merely reflects the new world but actively participates in its creation. In this way Marxist philosophy, while upholding and championing the principles of Marxism-Leninism that have long since vindicated themselves and continuing and developing Leninist traditions, is acquiring richer and more diverse content.

The increasing role of science in man's intellectual life, including his philosophical ideas, is all the more significant in view of the fact that science, which is being transformed into productive force, will in the future come to constitute the main and decisive form of social activity. During the present period of communist construction in the USSR when social and class differences have not yet been surmounted and when two opposed social systems are still in existence, political ideology plays a leading role in men's social thought, in the formation of their world outlook, since it serves to reflect the fundamental interests of the conflicting classes; at the same time the political ideology of socialism is now to an

increasing degree based on the fundamental principles and the achievements of science, scientific principles of management, planning and forecasting social processes. In the future when communism has emerged victorious on an international scale, when there will be no class conflict and the social management of men will give way more and more to control of things and processes, political ideology will relinquish its leading role in social thought to science, the all-round development of which will determine the philosophical, moral, ethical and all other aspects of the intellectual life of society and the individual.

Already at present Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought is not merely the province of professional philosophers engaged exclusively or predominantly in philosophical research or the teaching of philosophy. Leading organs and members of Communist parties are promoting the Marxist world outlook, providing theoretical substantiations for the major processes and transformations in the social and cultural life of society and leading the ideological struggle to promote the victory of the scientific, communist world outlook over the bourgeois world outlook. Soviet intellectuals from the fields of natural science and the humanities are also working to consolidate the Marxist world outlook by providing philosophical interpretations of scientific achievements, solving complex philosophical problems and elaborating the logic of scientific cognition. The same is true of writers and artists whose creative work involves the profound philosophical analysis of man's life and psychology side by side with active vindication of what is new in the struggle against vestiges of the past, with the implementation of high ideological, philosophical, moral and humanist ideals. Many teachers, representatives of the technical and creative intelligentsia and also foremost members of the working class and collectivised peasantry who are engaged in wide-scale effort to promote the ideological and theoretical education of broad sectors of the population, in particular the younger generation, are engaged in social research, the accumulation and dissemination of progressive, innovatory experience, the propaganda and elaboration of progressive political ideas, moral ideas, aesthetic taste, atheist convictions, thus promoting the development of the scientific materialist Marxist world out-

look. As a result of all this activity the tradition of Marxism-Leninism, based on the principle that philosophy must become and indeed is becoming the intellectual weapon of the proletariat, the whole toiling people, must emerge victorious.

The philosophy of Marxism, elaborated and raised to a still higher level by Lenin during the imperialist epoch, gripped the minds of the whole communist avant-garde of the international proletariat in the new historical epoch ushered in by the October Revolution and also gripped the minds of the revolutionary intelligentsia and many millions of working people. The Marxist-Leninist tradition is now the most influential theoretical and philosophical tradition of our age.

In keeping with this tradition Marxist philosophy bears a revolutionary-critical character and responds sensitively to the pulse of modern life, providing creative analyses of new social processes and scientific achievement. In the Theses published by the Central Committee of the CPSU on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution it was stated that Lenin's ideas "inspire the new generations of fighters for social transformations. Leninism is the eternal source of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action. The name of Lenin has become the symbol of the new world".*

It is becoming increasingly difficult for the opponents of Marxism at the present time to hold back the advance of Marxist teaching, to present it as something that has nothing to do with philosophy and which is "philosophically unsound". Marxist-Leninist philosophy has found firm root in the minds of millions, in social thought, science and culture. This explains why many anti-Marxist ideologists and opportunist elements now use another line of approach: in an effort to use for their own ends the prestige of Marxist philosophy they attempt to distort it, propagating false or twisted versions of Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy, its subject-matter and method.

As pointed earlier in this book revisionist and even some bourgeois ideologists hypocritically uphold the "philosophy of Marx". Meanwhile all they are really doing is firstly negat-

* *50th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Moscow, p. 6.

ing dialectical and historical materialism by declaring that the philosophy of Marxism at various stages in history was now abstract "humanism-naturalism", now "scientism" or the "political doctrine of revolutionary activism", etc., and must develop as the "integrated critical thought" of the individual, a trend implying that the individual must resist all types of alienation; secondly many contemporary would-be interpreters of Marxism-Leninism refuse to acknowledge Marxist philosophy as a science, asserting that true philosophy should be free of the "limitations" and "over-specialisation" implicit in science, which allegedly does not possess the "virtue of universality", and also free of the "conformism" with regard to the real world which they would have us believe is inherent in science.

Thirdly it is now a common practice among contemporary critics of Marxism to reject the world outlook and class and ideological slant of Marxist philosophy, in so far as they maintain that ideology was and remains a distorted, prejudiced conception of reality, which allegedly is inherent in any limited class-orientated point of view, including the world outlook of the proletariat.

Lenin foresaw that socialist ideology and Marxist theory in the contemporary epoch would find themselves face to face with acute conflicts and an irreconcilable struggle against bourgeois ideology, which, he was deeply convinced, would end in a victory for Marxism. When exposing all manner of attempts to "liquidate" Marxism, Lenin wrote that after each such "liquidation" Marxism became still more firmly rooted in the popular masses acquiring increased resilience and viability.

Showing no readiness to abandon its aggressive aspirations with regard to the socialist world or its schemes to liquidate Marxism-Leninism "from a position of strength", imperialist reaction is now pinning its hopes on the "erosion" of socialist ideology, on the "loosening-up" of Marxist theory and the prospect of "integration" of the world outlook of the socialist peoples with the bourgeois world outlook.

Rejecting the concepts of "convergence" and "integration" Communists for their part see the future of philosophy and the Marxist-Leninist world outlook to lie not in any ideological and theoretical rapprochement with the bourgeois world

outlook, which could only result in their ideologocial decapitation, but in the creative solution of new social and philosophical and theoretical problems pertaining to the latter half of the twentieth century, in the philosophical interpretation of the world revolutionary process and scientific achievements, in the scientific forecasting of the communist future including the future development of Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The best means of achieving these ends is to promote unswerving loyalty to Leninism, the bold elaboration of new problems in all spheres of social experience and science on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist dialectical method, and the active struggle against bourgeois ideology now marching irresistibly to its final collapse. In the Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 24th Congress it was stressed: "We have been and remain true to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and shall never make any concessions on questions of ideology."*

In the last part of the twentieth century it is important that Marxist philosophy should provide solutions for new "ontological" and sociological questions connected with the scientific and technological revolution and its social consequences, and not only for problems of an ethical, aesthetic and "anthropological" character, as demanded by certain foreign philosophers who have embraced revisionist principles and are out to destroy the international revolutionary teaching of Marxism-Leninism, such as Roger Garaudy.**

The ever-increasing volume of scientific information, the need for its systematic organisation and logical processing also make imperative the elaboration of new aspects of logic and scientific cognition, heuristics and methodological problems pertaining to specific sciences dealing with nature and society, the elaboration of a new creative approach to the logical and gnoseological aspects of philosophy that must progress further than the level already attained and look to the future to promote the broadening of the horizons of human knowledge and apprehend its new aspects and underlying laws.

In the last part of the twentieth century Marxist philosophy

* 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, p. 123.

** See R. Garaudy, *Marxisme du XX-ème siècle*, Paris-Genève, 1966.

is called upon to make a systematic and comprehensive study of questions connected with the history of philosophy, for without a profound knowledge of mankind's philosophical heritage meaningful theoretical activity is impossible. The wealth of modern man's intellectual experience, his broad cultural horizons and well-developed personality, particularly nowadays in this age of rapid and dynamic progress in technology and the natural sciences, depend to a considerable extent on the degree to which man's consciousness and intellectual activity are stimulated by his grasp of philosophical values handed down through history, the humanist ideals and historical optimism inherent in Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

Of late both "critics" of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and its exponents have been paying more and more attention to the future of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, to its role in the advance of social thought and to its influence on the intellectual experience of modern man and his destiny.

Considerable space was devoted earlier in this book to the ways certain interpreters of Marxist-Leninist philosophy among bourgeois Marxologists and certain misled writers in the ranks of foreign Communist parties and in the socialist countries describe the future of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Some of them hold that it will disintegrate and split into various national trends which have raised their head in certain Communist parties. Others maintain that Marxist philosophy is exposed to the danger of being swallowed up by "technocratic scientism" which they attribute to modern scientific thought, particularly that pertaining to the field of natural science and technology; they would have us believe that the revolutionary and critical spirit of Marxist philosophy and its ideological slant is alien to modern scientific thought. This leads many representatives of the Left bourgeois intelligentsia and certain extremist elements among foreign Communists to talk with no justification of Marxist theory "turning bourgeois", of its departure from socialist ideals and they often go so far as to substitute extremist theories of the export of revolution for its scientific and realistic, concretely historical and class-orientated approach to reality and the future of socialism.

Then again, as has also been pointed out on earlier occasions a number of bourgeois and revisionist ideologists

cherish the hope that the contemporary technological revolution will have identical social and intellectual consequences in the socialist countries as have appeared under capitalism, a development that they maintain would lead to an inevitable "deideologisation" of intellectual experience in socialist society, including that in the sphere of philosophy, to "convergence", rapprochement and finally to the creation of an "integrated" philosophy and sociology that would incorporate certain "attractive elements" of Marxism.

New major tasks and historic testing situations face Marxist-Leninist philosophy as it enters the final part of the twentieth century. However there is no foundation for the pessimistic conclusion widespread among "critics" of Marxist-Leninist philosophy to the effect that this philosophy has no future. The whole historical course of Marxist philosophy provides a decisive refutation of this incorrect conclusion. The force and viability of the principles of Marxist philosophy and the immutable significance of its traditions is borne out by all that has been achieved by Marxist philosophers, ever since this philosophy first emerged and developed despite harassment and fierce opposition from the ruling classes and representatives of those schools of philosophy which held sway under capitalism. This is demonstrated still more vividly by the difficult and complex, yet rich and fruitful historical path traversed by Marxist philosophy in our epoch, when for the first time in history it was able to develop freely, at first in one socialist country, the USSR, at a time when there was a serious lack of professionally trained Marxist philosophers and it had not yet found a firm foothold in science, social thought and culture and did not yet have millions of adherents as is now the case. Finally the enormous influence which Marxist-Leninist philosophy was to exert on science and culture, social thought and the intellectual experience of many people, even in years of the very grimmest experience (particularly during the war against fascism) and continues to exert nowadays, points to the fact that Marxist-Leninist philosophy can face the future with the utmost confidence.

Marxist philosophical science and the general theory of the international communist movement loyal to Leninist traditions cannot and indeed does not content itself with the level

of achievement already attained. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is an essentially dynamic teaching always creatively developing and able to assimilate and provide theoretical analysis of man's contemporary achievement and its scientific implications. Marxist philosophers like all fighters for communism are called upon to devote constant effort to the implementation of Lenin's behests expressed in the words: "The whole point is not to rest content with the skill we have acquired by previous experience, but *under all circumstances to go on, under all circumstances to strive for something bigger*, under all circumstances to proceed from simpler to more difficult tasks. Otherwise, no progress whatever is possible and in particular no progress is possible in socialist construction."*

Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy have now gained a firm hold over the minds of the revolutionary proletariat, of millions of working people in numerous countries all over the world. Marxist-Leninist philosophy provides the unshakeable ideological and theoretical foundation for the creative development of philosophical and social thought, the intellectual advance of all men and women working for the final triumph of communism.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 192.

NAME INDEX

- Adler, M.—210
 Adoratsky, V. V.—88, 138, 180, 190
 Aiken, Henry—276
 Aleksandrov, G. F.—89, 187, 204, 206
 Alekseyev, V. M.—184
 Akhundov, M. F.—193
 Althusser, Louis—74, 242, 243, 244
 Ambartsumyan, V. A.—299
 Ammon, Otto—47
 Ananyev, B. G.—92
 Angelov, S.—92, 219, 235
 Anokhin, P. K.—299
 Aptheker, H.—215, 254
 Aristotle—32, 42, 191, 204
 Aron, Raymond—80, 270, 272
 Arzhanov, M. A.—206
 Asmus, V. F.—187, 203
 Augustine, St.—249
 Avelings—123
 Axelrod-Ortodox, L. I.—88, 182
- Bach, A. N.—184
 Bakalov, G.—217
 Bakradze, K. S.—187, 196, 207
 Bakunin, M. A.—75
 Bankov, A.—281
 Banu, I.—249
 Barannikov, A. P.—184
 Barth, P.—244
 Batishchev, G. S.—250
 Bauer, O.—79, 206
 Bebel, August—123
- Beier, V.—243
 Belinsky, V. G.—28, 34, 129, 193
 Belkina, G. L.—91
 Bell, Daniel—270, 272
 Berdyayev, N. A.—154
 Berg, A. I.—299
 Bergner, D.—247
 Berkeley, D.—29
 Bernstein, E.—43, 75, 73, 79, 123, 124, 175
 Besse, Guy—212, 251, 254, 256
 Bittelman, A.—215
 Blagoev, Dimitr—123, 216, 217
 Blakeley, Thomas J.—63, 198, 263, 269
 Blanqui, A.—75, 212
 Bloch, Ernst—15, 235, 269, 273, 293
 Blonsky, P. P.—185
 Bocheński, Joseph—45, 68, 81, 82, 138, 152, 198, 252, 268-69, 271, 286
 Bogdanov, A. A.—34, 38, 39, 180, 294
 Bogomolov, A. S.—197, 207
 Botev, Khristo—205
 Brentano, L.—124
 Brezhnev, Leonid Ilyich—7, 8, 15, 134, 223, 228, 261, 300
 Browder—215
 Brzezinski, Zbigniew—63, 269-70
 Bubnov, A. S.—180
 Buhr, M.—247
 Bukharin, N.—15
 Burgete, A. P.—244
 Buyeva, L. I.—92

- Bychvarov, M.—217
 Bukhovsky, B. E.—204, 206, 299
 Bunkov, A.—219
 Bustryansky, V. A.—35, 180, 190

 Cachin, Marcel—86, 147, 211
 Cerroni, Umberto—277
 Chagin, B. A.—138, 176, 206
 Chalovan V. K.—195
 Chardin, Teilhard de—274
 Chavchavadze, I. G.—193
 Chelpanov, G. I.—185
 Chernigovsky, V. N.—299
 Chernyshevsky, N. G.—26, 28, 32, 34, 41, 64, 129, 130, 133, 193
 Chesnokov, D.—204
 Chu Chiu-po—147
 Cogniot, Georges—211, 248
 Cornforth, Maurice—251-52
 Cornu, Auguste—212, 246
 Croce, Benedetto—213

 Danelia, S. I.—185
 Dauge, P.—206
 Deborin, A. M.—88, 182, 190, 194, 206, 220
 Debray, Régis—255
 Debs, Eugene—214
 Descartes, R.—27, 35, 191
 Dias, Jose—147
 Dietzgen, Joseph—123, 206, 214
 Diderot, D.—64, 104, 191, 204
 Dimitrov, Georgi—147, 217
 Dimitrov, Mikhail—217, 219
 Djilas, Milovan—68, 238
 Dobriyanov, V.—219
 Dobrolyubov, N. A.—193
 Dubinin, N. P.—299
 Duclos, Jacques—86, 211
 Dumazedier, J.—256
 Duncker, Herman—138, 190, 210, 211, 220
 Dunham, Barrows—215, 249
 Dutt, Palme R.—86
 Dynnik, M. A.—187

 Efrov, S. A.—197, 207, 243
 Eichborn, W.—233
 Einsiedel, A.—247
 Einstein, A.—249
 Engels, Frederick—18, 19, 21-26, 33, 45, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60-61, 62-65, 66, 67, 69, 71-75, 77, 79-81, 89, 90, 93, 94, 96-98, 105, 107, 108, 110, 113-116, 119, 124, 126-28, 131-35, 156, 162-63, 170, 172, 174-75, 177, 191, 204, 212, 220, 246, 280, 289, 292

 Falk, H.—296
 Farabi, A. N. M.—193
 Fedoseyev, P. N.—206
 Fetscher, Iring—15, 68, 76, 238, 269
 Feuerbach, Ludwig—69, 71, 88, 90, 97, 116, 125, 126, 191, 204
 Fichte, I. G.—93, 247
 Filipović, Muhamed—138
 Filkenstein, S.—215
 Fischer, Ernst—70, 94, 160, 238, 242, 259, 265, 276, 277, 286
 Fischl, Johann—48
 Flewelling, R. T.—44
 Fogarasi, Béla—207, 216, 221
 Fok, V. A.—299
 Forster, G.—247
 Foster, William—86, 147, 214, 215
 Frank, Phillip—49
 Frank, S.—183
 Franko, I. Ya.—193
 Frantsev, Y. P.—207
 Freud, Z.—249
 Fritzhand, M.—235
 Fromm, Erich—70, 252, 269, 270-71, 278, 293
 Frunze, Mikhail V.—138
 Fucco, M.—244
 Fukas, D.—221

 Gagarin, A. P.—206
 Gallacher, William—86, 147
 Ganovsky, S.—138, 190, 207, 216, 217, 219, 246

- Garaudy, Roger—16, 45, 70, 160,
 175, 200, 234, 238, 254, 256
 306
 Garin, Eugenio—214, 248, 256
 Gates, J.—215
 Gedö, A.—221, 234, 256
 Genov, P.—217
 Gindev, P.—219
 Girginov, G.—219
 Gisselbrecht, A.—253
 Glockner, Hermann—49, 281
 Goethe, J. W.—104, 247
 Goldman, L.—70
 Gorokhov, F. A.—138, 190
 Gottwald, Klement—147
 Gramsci, Antonio—69, 86, 147,
 148, 212, 213, 214, 277
 Gregor, A.—45
 Grigoryan, S. N.—205
 Grlić, D.—259
 Gropp, Rugard—247
 Grushevsky, M.—193
 Gukovsky, M.—204
 Gulian, C. I.—92, 234, 235, 249
 Guscinov, G.—204

 Hager, Kurt—211
 Hall, Gus—86, 148, 214, 215
 Harris, R.—48
 Havemann, Robert—242
 Hegel, G. W. F.—10, 12, 27, 32,
 42, 44, 46, 47, 53, 56, 57, 58,
 76, 88, 90, 91, 99, 125, 128, 162,
 188, 190, 191, 194, 201, 204,
 213, 220, 247, 248, 249
 Heidegger, M.—256, 274
 Helvétius, C. A.—104, 160, 191
 Heraclitus—27
 Herder, I. G.—104, 247
 Herzen, A. I.—26, 32, 34, 40, 64,
 129, 193, 204
 Heveshi, M. A.—205
 Heywood, William—214
 Hirschberger, Johannes—49
 Hobbes, T.—191
 Ho Chi Minh—147
 Holbach, P.-A.—35, 45, 126, 160,
 191, 249
 Hook, Sidney—45, 68, 77, 78, 80,
 215, 252, 268, 269

 Huebl, Milan—212
 Hume, D.—29, 231
 Huntington, Samuel—63
 Hüsserl, E.—256, 274

 Ilvichev, L. F.—206
 Iovchuk, M. T.—8, 89, 244
 Irubadzhakov, N.—219

 Jakobson, Karl—193
 Jaroszewski, T.—235, 246
 Jaspers, Karl—50
 Jaurès, Jean—123
 Jerome, Victor—215
 Joliot-Curie, Frédéric—212

 Kalinin, M. I.—137
 Kammari, M.—138
 Kanapa, Jean—212
 Kant, I.—123, 247
 Kan Yu-vai—205
 Karakolov, R.—216, 219
 Karavelov, Luben—205
 Karev, N. A.—190
 Katayama, Sen—147
 Kautsky, Karl—46, 79, 123, 125,
 127, 155, 175, 206, 210
 Kedrov, B. M.—204, 290
 Keldysh, M. V.—299
 Kierkegaard, S.—47, 256
 Kirov, S. M.—137
 Kiselinchev, A. H.—217, 219
 Kiss, A.—221, 234
 Klaus, G.—247
 Klein, Matthäus—184, 211, 234
 Köhler, Hans—91
 Kolakowski, Leszek—70, 238
 Kolarov, Vasil—147, 217
 Kon, I.—197
 Konrad, N. I.—195, 205
 Konstantinov, F. V.—138, 190,
 206
 Korsch, Karl—210
 Kósik, Karl—232, 238, 256
 Kosing, A.—105, 211, 234, 235,
 251
 Kovalyov, S. M.—92
 Krachkovsky, I. U.—184
 Krasin, Y. A.—269

- Krupskaya, N. K.—137
 Kubitsky, A. V.—185
 Kuibyshev, V. V.—137
 Kun, Béla—147, 220
 Kunanbayev, Abai—193
 Kunow, G.—79
 Kursanov, G. A.—207
 Kuusinen, Otto—147
- Labedz, Leopold—233
 Labriola, Antonio—88, 123, 212, 214
 Lafargue, Paul—19, 79, 122, 123, 124, 126, 176, 206
 Lamettrie, J.—191, 249
 Lamont, Corlios—215
 Lange, Max—68, 138
 Langevin, Paul—212
 Lapin, N.—105
 Lauwe, Chombait de—256
 Lebedev-Polyansky, P. I.—180
 Lefebvre, Henri—15, 45, 70
 Leibnitz, G. V.—32
 Leković, D.—105, 235
 Lemann, E.—49
 Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich—7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 21, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 57, 61, 64, 66, 69, 74, 75, 78, 80, 82, 94, 95, 96, 99, 115, 116, 120, 133, 134-35, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145-48, 152, 154, 155, 156-57, 158-59, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167-69, 170-71, 172, 174-75, 176, 177, 179, 182, 183, 185, 188, 189, 191, 197, 200, 201, 204, 209, 210, 211, 213, 217, 219, 220, 221, 224, 234, 235, 250, 256, 260-61, 262, 265, 277, 278, 280-81, 284, 288-89, 290, 297, 299-300, 304, 309
 Lenski, Yu.—147
 Leon, Daniel de—214
 Leonardo da Vinci—204
 Leonhard, Wolfgang—68, 81, 238, 268
 Lessing, G. E.—104
 Lévi-Strauss—244
- Lewis, John—246, 252
 Ley, Hermann—211, 248
 Li Ta-chao—147
 Liebknecht, Karl—86, 123
 Lomonosov, M. V.—193
 Longo, Luigi—86
 Lopatin, L.—183
 Losev, A. F.—185
 Lossky, N. O.—183
 Lovejoy, Arthur—48
 Löwenthal, L.—269
 Lucretius—249
 Lukács, Georg—69, 220, 221, 243
 Lunacharsky, A. V.—39, 40, 137, 180
 Luporini, C.—244
 Luppöl, I. K.—138, 187, 190, 204
 Luxemburg, Rosa—86, 123, 176
- Makovelsky, A. O.—185, 195, 205
 Manuilsky, D. Z.—137
 Mao Tse-tung—293
 Marchlewski, Yu.—147
 Marcuse, Herbert—15, 68, 70, 76, 238, 253, 264, 269, 278-79
 Marek, Franz—265
 Marx, Karl—11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 113, 115, 116, 119, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130-33, 134, 135, 137, 148, 154, 156, 159, 160, 162-63, 164, 166, 170-71, 172, 174-75, 177, 188, 191, 194, 207, 210, 212, 213, 214, 220, 234, 242, 245, 246, 249, 252, 253, 265, 270, 276, 280-81
 Mechnikov, I. I.—193
 Mehnert, Klaus—238, 275
 Mehring, Franz—19, 79, 86, 88, 122, 124, 125, 126, 176, 206, 210, 281

- Melvil, Y. K.—207
 Mende, Georg—211
 Mendeleyev, D. I.—193
 Meyer, Alfred—68, 80, 268-69
 Mikhailov, Stoyan—219, 236
 Mikhailovsky, N.—43
 Mikhalenko, Y. P.—252
 Mikulak, M.—274
 Millerand, A.—124
 Mills, C. Wright—51
 Minin, S. K.—38, 39
 Mitin, M. B.—138, 190, 206
 Moleschott, J.—125
 Molnár, Erik—221
 Momjan, Kh. N.—176, 204, 206
 Mougin, Henri—212
 Mshvenieradze, V. V.—207
 Myslivchenko, A. G.—92
- Nalbandyan, M. L.—193
 Narsky, I. S.—108, 197, 204, 205, 207
 Natzmer, Gert von—110
 Nedelković, D.—249
 Nejedlý, Zdeněk—216
 Nevsky, V. I.—137, 180
 Niemeyer, Gerhart—81, 82, 138
 Nutsbidze, Sh. I.—185
- Oduyev, S. F.—197, 207
 Oizerman, T. I.—48, 105, 197, 204, 207, 293
 Okulov, A. F.—207
 Oldenburg, S. F.—184
 Olmsky, M. S.—138
 Omelyanovsky, M. E.—204
 Oshavkov, Z.—219
 Osipova, Y. V.—205
 Owen, Robert—106, 114
- Pavlov, D.—219
 Pavlov, I. P.—184
 Pavlov, Todor D.—138, 160, 190, 207, 216, 217, 219, 246
 Perry, Ralph—49
 Petrosyan, M. I.—92
 Petrov, A. A.—205
 Petrović, G.—70, 160, 234
- Pieck, Wilhelm—56, 147
 Planty-Bonjour, G.—279
 Plato—123, 191
 Plekhanov, G. V.—19, 34, 45, 56, 69, 79, 88, 89, 122, 126, 127, 128-29, 130-33, 155, 204, 256
 Pletnev, V.—38
 Pokrovsky, M. N.—150
 Politzer, Georges—211-12
 Pollitt, Harry—86, 147
 Popov, P. S.—135
 Popov, S. I.—176, 207
 Priestley, J.—191
 Proudhon, P.-J.—75
 Průcha, Milan—52, 234, 274-75
- Radlov, E.—136
 Radul-Zatulovsky, Y.—205
 Raggioneri, Ernesto—214
 Rainis, Jan—193
 Reichenbach, Hans—49
 Reimann, Max—86, 211
 Richta, R.—49
 Robinet, J.—204
 Rochet, Waldek—56, 211, 254
 Röhr, H.—80
 Rony, Jean—253
 Rosental, M. M.—206
 Rudas, László—207, 220
 Rudniański, Stefan—216
 Ruml, V.—235, 256
 Russell, Bertrand—49, 51
 Ryazanov, D. B.—83
 Ryle, G.—252
- Saint-Simon, K. A.—114, 212
 Sandor, Pal—221
 Santo, L.—246
 Sartre, Jean-Paul—51, 70, 252, 253, 256, 269, 278
 Schaff, A.—172
 Schelling, F. V.—191
 Schilling, K.—50
 Schleifstein, Josef—176, 211, 251
 Schmidt, K.—79
 Schopenhauer, A.—47
 Schorlemmer, Karl—123
 Sechenov, I. M.—193

- Seidel H.—239
 Sellars, R. W.—215
 Selsam, Howard—215
 Semyonov, N. N.—299
 Semyonov, V. S.—207
 Semyonov, Y. N.—207
 Serebryakov, M. V.—180, 204
 Sève, Lucien—212, 244, 248, 251, 254, 281
 Sezemanas, V.—185
 Shcheglov, A. V.—138
 Shcherbatsky, F. I.—184
 Shevchenko, T. G.—193
 Shishkin, A. F.—207
 Shulyatkov, V. M.—34, 35
 Šik, Ota—230, 232
 Sina, Ibn—193
 Siratsky, A.—235
 Sitkovsky, E. P.—187, 204
 Skvortsov, L. V.—55, 197, 207, 269
 Skvortsov-Stepanov, I. I.—180
 Smirnov, G. A.—92
 Solomon, Jacques—212
 Solovyov, Vladimir—184
 Somerville, John—215
 Sorge, Friedrich—214
 Sorokin, Pitirim A.—82, 184, 272, 286-87
 Spengler, Oswald—185
 Spinoza, B.—64, 126, 191
 Stalin, Joseph V.—138, 139, 140, 141, 149, 198
 Stefanov, N.—219
 Steigerwald, Robert—211, 253
 Stienhler, G.—247
 Stojanović, S.—235
 Stojković, A.—235
 Stolpner, B.—185
 Stroik, D.—215
 Struve, Pyotr—26, 43, 183
 Stuchka, Pyotr—138
 Sun Yat-sen—32
 Supek, Rudi—72, 160, 231, 271
 Sviták, Ivan—232
 Szigeti, Y.—221
 Tadić, L.—235
 Talheimer, August—210
 Thälmann, Ernst—86, 147, 211
 Thorez, Maurice—86, 147, 211, 212
 Tikhvinsky, S. L.—205
 Timiryazev, K. A.—204
 Togliatti, Palmiro—69, 86, 147, 212, 213, 214
 Tokei, F.—221
 Toland, D.—191
 Tolstoy, L. N.—32, 34
 Trakhtenberg, O. V.—187
 Trendafilov, N.—219
 Troitsky, A. Ya.—138
 Trotsky, Leon—15, 138
 Trubetskoi, E. N.—183
 Ulam, Adam—269
 Ulbricht, Walter—86
 Ulugbek—193
 Van Bhi—204
 Varga, E. S.—220
 Vasetsky, G. S.—187, 204
 Vásques, S.—243, 244
 Vernadsky, V. I.—184
 Virtand, A.—221
 Vogt, B.—125, 185
 Volfson, S. Y.—206
 Volgin, V. P.—204
 Volkova, V.—206
 Vollmar, G.—75
 Volpe, Galvano Della—245
 Voltaire, F.-M.—249
 Vorländer, K.—124
 Vorobyov, L. S.—205
 Vorovsky, V. V.—180
 Vranicki, Predrag—70, 82, 94, 286
 Vylov, T.—219
 Wells, Harry—215, 251
 Wetter, Gustav—45, 68, 80, 81, 138, 198, 268-69
 Weydemeyer, Joseph—214
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig—49, 252
 Wood, Roy—215

-
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Yakhiel, N.—219 | Yushkevich P. S.—153 |
| Yakovlev, M. V.—48, 55, 197, 207 | |
| Yakushevsky, I. T.—197, 269 | Zamoshkin, Y. A.—207 |
| Yaroslavsky, Y. M.—138, 180, 182, 206 | Zasulich, V.—127 |
| Yegorov, A. G.—207 | Zhdanov, A. A.—89 |
| Yudin, P. F.—138, 190, 206 | Zetkin, Klara—56, 147 |
| | Zinoviyev, G. Y.—153 |

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

**PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
PUT OUT RECENTLY**

World Communist Movement

This book is about the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and of the strategy and tactics of the communist movement. It shows the characteristic features of the contemporary working-class movement and the reasons for its split, the co-operation between the Communists and Socialists in various countries, the Communist Parties' policies towards the peasantry, the youth, the middle urban strata of the intelligentsia and religious believers, and the struggle for national liberation and democracy. The authors reveal the substance of both Right-wing and "Left" opportunism and the ways in which they manifest themselves, and they show the damage opportunism is doing to the struggle for social progress.

Cloth 13×20 cm 400 pp.